

# *Cardinal Thomas Cajetan*

## *Sonnet 4.6 Translation*



# **On The Divine Institution Of The Papacy**

# **APOLOGIA II**

**of Cardinal Thomas de Vio Cajetan**

*Master General of the Order of Preachers*

**On the Divine Institution of The Pontificate  
of the Roman Pontiff over the Whole Church,  
By Christ in Peter**

---

*Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church*

*Translated by @ofsaintthomas on X*

***Dedicated to His Holiness,  
Pope Leo X***

## COMMENDATORY VERSES

*Written by Pontius Petreius*

---

It was Thomas's own way not to believe  
what he had not first seen and touched with his  
hands. But you, another Thomas, who consult the  
orthodox dispute so diligently and so acutely  
that whoever thinks otherwise thinks nothing.  
You who teach the truth thus and thus expose it,  
so it may be seen with the eyes and touched with  
the hand.

---

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS:**

**Chapter I.** What is to be discussed, how, and in what order.

**Chapter II.** That the keys were promised to Peter's person, not by a gift of revelation or of blessedness.

**Chapter III.** That the keys are promised to Peter's person in itself, and not only in the person of the Church.

**Chapter IV.** That the words of Christ, "I will give you the keys", were not said to Peter in the person of all the apostles.

**Chapter V.** That the other apostles were not given the same as was conferred on Peter.

**Chapter VI.** That Peter alone received the keys is consistent with the Church having received the keys.

**Chapter VII.** That the pontificate of the whole Church was promised to Peter in the foregoing promises.

**Chapter VIII.** That "Feed my sheep" was said to Peter's person, even though qualified by charity.

**Chapter IX.** That "Feed my sheep" was said to

Peter alone, not in the same way to the other apostles.

**Chapter X.** That the universal Church was committed to Peter alone by Christ's words, "Feed my sheep".

**Chapter XI.** That by the words "Feed my sheep", the pontificate of the whole Church was committed by Christ to Peter.

**Chapter XII.** That Peter possesses, by the institution of Christ, a successor in the pontificate of the Catholic Church.

**Chapter XIII.** That the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter in the pontificate of the whole Church.

**Chapter XIV.** Authorities of the ancient saints and councils affirming that the pontificate of the Roman Pontiff, as successor of Peter, over the whole Church was instituted by Christ in Peter.

---

## CHAPTER ONE

### *What Is to Be Discussed, and in What Order*

---

The primacy of the Roman Pontiff over all the churches of Christ, although it has been buffeted by many controversies, is nevertheless something that our inquiry must resolve in a single investigation. For the question is not here whether the Roman Pontiff is in fact the head of the Church, nor whether he holds his power from God — in the manner of Romans 13, where the Apostle says there is no power except from God, and those that exist are ordained by God, just as royal power in the Old Testament was from God, as in 1 Kings 8: "Listen to their voice and set a king over them." Many adversaries affirm all this. What is called into question is whether the principate of the Roman Pontiff over all churches was instituted by Christ in blessed Peter — that is, whether Christ instituted Peter, with his successors, as His Vicar for governing all the churches of Christ.

The consequence is that passages from reasons and authorities affirming that Peter, or the Roman Pontiff, was or is the head of all the churches, are to be set aside from the present inquiry; and only those things are to be adduced from which it clearly follows that Christ the Lord conferred such a principate on Peter alone.

Now since the entire truth of this question depends on sacred scripture, and there are two principal texts which speak expressly about this mystery — namely Matthew 16 and John 21 — we must first investigate from each text whether Christ's words were said to Peter alone.

**Second:** whether through these words the pontificate of the whole Church was committed to Peter alone by Christ.

**Third:** whether this pontificate of the whole Church, committed to Peter by Christ, was given by the same Lord to Peter's successor.

**Fourth:** whether this pontificate, given here to Peter, was given by Christ to the Roman Pontiff as Peter's successor.

So that the resolution of Matthew's text may be clear from the outset, we must first treat the opinion of those who say Christ's words were addressed not to Peter but to a qualified person; then those who say not to Peter but to the Church; then those who say to Peter and the other apostles; and finally those who deny they were addressed to Peter alone. Many have tried to obscure the dominical promise of Matthew 16. Some restrict these words so far as to remove Peter's person from them entirely, understanding them to refer only to a divine gift directed at Peter. Others direct Christ's words to the Church alone signified in Peter. Many extend the promise to the other apostles, understanding Peter as speaking in the person of all. Some admit the words were said to Peter alone but deny that singularity of principate was

conferred on him, since similar power was elsewhere given by Christ to the other apostles — e.g. Matthew 18: "Whatever you shall have bound." Others hesitate over how it can be verified that the keys were given to Peter alone while all assert the keys were also given to the Church. These five opinions are to be treated in order, setting out the reasons for doubting in each, so that the opposing views may shine more clearly.

---

## CHAPTER TWO

### *That the Keys Were Not Promised to Peter's Person by a Gift of Revelation or of Blessedness*

---

There are those who dogmatize that pontifical power was not conferred immediately upon a man, but through the mediation of a gift of virtue — so that if the gift of virtue is lost, the pontifical power necessarily perishes with it, as if virtue were a kind of glue joining man to the pontificate. In their judgment the keys belong not to Peter's person but to the gift conferred on him through some singular minister, such as a priest or any just person.

They argue from the Matthean text in multiple ways.

**First:** Before all else the Lord affirms Peter's blessedness, saying "Blessed are you" — clearly indicating true blessedness in hope of faith. He would not have begun from Simon's blessedness unless that

blessedness were ordered to the subsequent pontificate. Nothing impertinent befits Christ to say.

**Second:** The Lord adds "Simon Bar-Jona" — that is, son of the dove, as Jerome explains. Why is Peter, about to receive the pontificate, called son of the dove, unless either his simplicity (signified by the dove: "Be wise as serpents and simple as doves") or the Holy Spirit (designated by the dove, appearing at Christ's baptism) pertains to the ecclesiastical principate?

**Third:** From the annexed reason: "Flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven." This shows that this matter is not to be demonstrated from flesh and blood but by divine revelation — that one is to be instructed in the Christian faith and to teach others.

**Fourth:** The Lord added "You are Peter" — not "you will be called Peter," as the gloss notes — on account of the firmness of faith and constancy of confession. This with all the preceding pertains to virtuous work, which as stated was either proposed impertinently to the principate or promised as appropriate means subsequently.

**Fifth:** From the first promise attached: "Upon this rock I will build my church." For while this is the first promise made to Peter (since, as Cyprian, Jerome, and Augustine expound it, through this rock Peter himself is demonstrated — Jerome says: "I will build my church upon you" — and Augustine in the *Retractations* reports having said it was in the apostle Peter as upon a rock), the promise pertains not

immediately but through the gift of firmness and solidity to Peter's person, as the Lord's own words testify (for he said not "upon you" but "upon this rock") — hence the subsequent promises are understood as made to the person of Simon insofar as he was Peter, son of the dove, and blessed.

*Confirmation:* This promise is not only the first but the principal one — for the chief gift given to Peter is to be the foundation of the Church. Since this promise is first and principal, the other consequent promises follow the nature of the principal; and therefore no promise was made to human nature simply except through the mediation of the gift of virtue — which was what was intended to be demonstrated.

It is not difficult for the Catholic teacher to show this opinion to be false by reducing it to damnable consequences. For it is nothing other than the dogma of heretics who say ecclesiastical power cannot be found in evil ministers — that the keys of the Church exist only in the just alone, and that the Church and her keys are found only in the just, and that the Church consists of the just alone — all of which is established as rejected and condemned.

But so that heretics not think themselves oppressed by the authority of prelates rather than the Gospel: the ratio of Catholic doctrine must be rendered from the evangelical text itself. Note that there are in this dominical address to Peter two parts, of which the first, according to the plain Gospel context and sense, pertains to the confession Peter made. For it contains nothing other than the actor, fruit, and person of the revealed confession, and the condition of the person

to whom the revelation was made. In saying "Blessed are you" the fruit or reward is pronounced; in saying "Simon Bar-Jona" the person is addressed literally, or mystically the condition of the person who received the revelation; and in saying "flesh and blood has not revealed this to you but my Father" the actor of the revelation is shown. The entire first part of the dominical address to Peter pertains therefore to the revealed confession, and to the approval of faith concerning Christ himself the living Son of God.

The second part turns to what is to be promised to Peter, beginning from the rendering of his name: "And I say to you, you are Peter" — as if he said to him literally: "You said to me: you are Christ; and I say to you: you are Peter." Note well that not diverse but various kinds of promises are made to Peter. For the first promise regards the construction of the Church ("I will build my church upon you"); the second regards authority ("I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven"); and whatever you loose, etc. The first regards the substance of the Church, the second its office — they differ as much as substance and office differ. And though in the first promise a triple meaning may be found — by which this rock means either Christ, or Peter, or Peter's confession (as Chrysostom expounds it) — if we look more subtly there is one literal sense: that through this rock, Peter is demonstrated. For Augustine in the first book of the *Retractations*, chapter 21, leaves it to the reader's judgment which of the two opinions is more probable — whether Peter or Christ is demonstrated through this rock. Taking that liberty, from the Gospel text itself we say: through this rock, Peter is demonstrated,

as appears from the fact that the Lord said "upon this rock I will build." For if he had demonstrated himself, he would not have said "I will build" but "I build," since then he was truly building upon himself, making Simon into Peter. But upon Peter he was not then but after the resurrection building — and therefore said in the future tense "I will build" — as if openly saying: "He whom I am now making Peter, I will afterward make the foundation of my Church."

This sense is confirmed because otherwise he would have impertinently prefaced "you are Peter" — since for such a great thing said to Peter in the Gospel it is insinuated that when the Lord quasi-rendering to Peter said "you are Peter," how great would it sound to be Peter, or what would it mean to be Peter, unless it were subsequently demonstrated that upon this rock he would build his Church?

And Chrysostom expounding this says: "That it is the same rock, building the Church upon it, is well said; for according to the metaphor of the rock proposed, whatever exists in Peter is individuated — and this is what is in the very person of Peter." With this integral literal sense therefore accepted and admitted, and opening further from the Gospel: all the promises made to Peter converge on this — that all were made to the unique person of Simon himself who is called Peter, to whom it was said "you are Peter." And it is manifested thus to be: first of the first promise, then of the second. In the first promise three things are noted: first "you," second "are Peter," third "upon this rock." By the pronoun "you" the person to whom Christ was speaking is demonstrated — a person I

say, not some quality; for it is established that the pronoun "you" demonstrates substance without quality even among grammarians. Again from the pronoun "you," one unique person is demonstrated as is evident. From the conjunction "therefore" that "you are Peter" — it is openly affirmed by the Lord that that unique person is Peter, and because through this rock the same rock is demonstrated which was then demonstrated by "you are Peter"; and the most significant article "this" expresses that the same rock is shown of which the discourse was then, which was also demonstrated by the pronoun "you are Peter" — and this so much the more clearly as no other rock is then found demonstrated or named in the Gospel. That therefore the future foundation of Christ's Church is joined to this rock — which because it is joined to the person demonstrated by "you," we must understand that the foundation of Christ's Church is promised to the unique person demonstrated by "you," to whom it was then established to be Peter.

---

## CHAPTER THREE

### *That the Keys Are Promised to Peter's Person in Itself, and Not Only in the Person of the Church*

---

Those far removed from the prior errors affirm that the keys of the kingdom of heaven were promised not to Peter but to the Church by Christ, saying: "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven" — as though he said "to you, that is, to the Church signified through you, I will give the keys of the kingdom of heaven" — and not personally to you. These share with the former the aim of removing Peter from this dominical promise, asserting that the keys are not given to any singular man but by gift of God are promised to the Church alone.

They argue thus:

**First:** Christ in the Gospel exposes himself — to whom he speaks and to whom he hands over the keys — saying: "Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jona; flesh and blood has not revealed this to you." Here plainly Peter is not Peter, not flesh, not blood, not Simon Bar-Jona — Peter is placed altogether outside the man, and now there is no person in itself but the listener of the revealing Father to whom the keys are given. Therefore no private man was given the keys,

but to the Church alone — since of no private man are we certain he has this revelation of the Father. The Church itself is this of which we cannot doubt — she herself is therefore that Peter, listener of the revelation and receiver of the keys.

**Second:** From the context. For Christ after this glorious commendation of Peter, when Peter prohibited him from dying, rebuked Peter: "Get behind me, Satan; you do not think the things of God." So that from the subsequent rebuke after the commendation it may be clear that the superior Peter who received the keys was not Peter the son of Bar-Jona, but the Church the daughter of God — which hears the word of God and keeps it to the end, never retreating at God's command as Peter did.

**Third:** From Christ's word "upon this rock I will build my church" — that is, upon the faith confessed by Peter in the name of the whole Church — and hence in whatever church there is the rock of faith, there also are the keys.

*Confirmation:* Because this very promise is not only first but principal — for the chief gift given to Peter is to be the foundation of the Church — since this promise is first and principal, it follows that it was not made to simple human nature but with the mediation of the gift of virtue.

*To be confirmed:* Because Peter himself did not persevere in the same confession, since shortly after receiving the keys he denied; and yet the keys were not given back to him — hence not in his own person but in the Church's person he received them.

**Refutation:** These things are answered from what was said about the first part of the Lord's address to Peter, for there was demonstrated that the entire first part pertains to the revealed confession and not to the future pontificate. To draw Peter's mystical conditions to the Church by mystical interpretation — while it is tolerable — it is nevertheless intolerable that the mystical sense should exclude the literal, that Peter should exclude himself, and the listener should exclude him who listened. To the second it is said falsely to interpret the reason why after such commendation Peter was rebuked — for according to the plain literal sense, commendation is first made of Peter's person by reason of divine gift, then rebuke by reason of his own sense; neither pertains to a different history than to Peter, since both commendation and rebuke were personal. To the third it is said: through this rock, Peter is demonstrated literally as appears from what was said. And therefore it does not follow that to every partial church where there is faith, the keys are equally given — it suffices that to any faithful church the keys are given in the head of the whole Church, which is this rock upon which Christ builds his Church.

*To the confirmation:* Because though Peter erred, he did not cease to be a rock — since by those words that are objected, "Far be it from you, Lord, this will not happen to you," Peter neither lost faith nor charity. Therefore the Lord did not say to him "Get behind me Satan" (as he had said to the tempter) but modified it, saying "Get behind me Satan" — as if saying: "You ought to follow me, not your own feeling." For as was said above, when afterward he

denied Christ he did not lose faith — but the rock of faith persevered in his heart. And yet as Theophylact on Luke 22 noted, Christ restored him again in the apostolic grade, saying "Confirm your brothers." To the fourth it is said: when a Pope is elected, he neither brings the keys with him nor receives them from the Church, but from Christ — not by a new tradition, but by that same ancient one by which he gave them to Peter. For the Church by the ministry of election deposes the person who succeeds Peter; Christ himself in blessed Peter gives the keys to each successor — and therefore the question is vain, from whom he receives them, or to whom he leaves them dying; for the word of Christ always gives the keys to each succeeding one and not one to another.

To the fifth it is said: the argument is of similar form but dissimilar matter — and therefore it does not hold. For justice and good faith are qualities of the soul for the use of the one believing, and the just man has keys signifying authority ordained for the government of others — and therefore, though to any believing and confessing Christ, faith is reputed to justice as to Abraham's; not however to any believer and confessor of Christ — no, not even to any who imitates the rock of faith of Peter — are the keys to be given, which means the power of opening and closing. Since of no one can it be constantly, certainly, and perseveringly had this confession as even of Peter himself it is evident.

To the sixth it is said truly, and that the Church received the keys, and that Peter bore the person of the Church's figure, and that the unity of Peter

signified the unity of the Church. But in this the arguments fail, and from these truths into another truth they go astray — for these truths are not contrary to this other truth, that Peter in his own person received the keys. For both the first and the last (as will appear in chapter 6) pertain to the truth of the literal sense, since at the letter Peter in his proper person so received the keys that the Church also received the same. The rest pertain to the truth of the mystical sense — for according to the spiritual sense one Peter signifies the unity of the Church and the universal Church, etc.

---

## CHAPTER FOUR

### *That Christ's Words "I Will Give You the Keys" Were Not Said to Peter in the Person of All the Apostles*

---

With the prior errors excluded, we now treat the opinion of those who understand Peter, in the words addressed to him by Christ, to speak in the person of all the apostles: "I will give you the keys, etc." They bring four arguments.

**First:** From the Lord's interrogation — for he interrogated not Peter alone but all together: "Who do you say that I am?"

**Second:** From Peter's person — because Peter was first of all the apostles and took on the role of all in responding. Hence Chrysostom says: when the disciples were questioned, Peter as the mouth of the apostles and head responds for all.

*Confirmation:* Because if Peter had not responded in the person of all, the response expected from the others would have been omitted, or Peter's response would have been accepted without the others' ratification — which would have been inappropriate.

**Third:** From the structure of the text, since the keys of the kingdom of heaven were given to all the apostles in common.

**Fourth:** From the common principle, since Christ said "What I say to one, I say to all."

Before responding to these, from the plain sense of the evangelical text it must be shown that the Lord's words were directed to Peter alone. This is clear first from the principle of the dominical address to Peter, when he said "Blessed are you, Simon Bar-Jona" — this cannot refer to all, for it expresses the proper name of Simon and explains whose natural son he is, saying Bar-Jona, i.e. son of Jonah. And again it would have been false of Judas — since John 6, chapter 12, relates that when the Lord had said "Do you also wish to go away?" the apostles said "Lord, to whom shall we go?" — and Peter responded "We believe and know that you are the Christ the Son of God" — and immediately the Lord responded to them "Have I not chosen you twelve? And one of you is a devil." And again at the end of the same chapter: "Jesus knew

from the beginning who believed not and who would betray him." Hence it cannot be verified that "Blessed are you" was said to all the apostles, since one of them did not believe in Christ as John 6 testifies.

**Second:** From the conjoined reason, because "flesh and blood has not revealed this to you, but my Father who is in heaven." From the Lord's own words it is established that the revelation was made to Peter specifically — so that to deny this would be contrary to faith. But it is not established from scripture that such a revelation was made to the other apostles as well — and therefore by the same facility it is contained because it is affirmed. It is established therefore from this that the address of the Lord is directed to Peter — and it is not established that it extends to others.

**Third:** From the conjoined affirmation "you are Peter" — for it shows both the pronoun "you" and the name given to him first by Christ at the beginning of discipleship, namely Peter, and the interior gift of revelation; what was not conceded to others, it is not sufficiently signified to have been given to others. Hence it is established that the address is to Peter alone — with what words it would have had to be described by the evangelist that the address was to Peter alone. And it is confirmed: because the Lord used the same demonstrative pronoun subjoining "and I will give you, etc." And it is confirmed from the fact that not by more or greater circumstances do notaries describe and nominate from noted persons their heirs or legatees than does the person of Peter in this text described and named — as is clear by

collecting: Simon son of Jonah, Peter from the internal revelation commended, from the further future position of the Church.

From the words therefore and the sense of the words it is clearly apparent that the words were spoken to Peter alone: "I will give you the keys, etc."

**To the first objection in opposition** it is said: the fact that the Lord interrogated all does not require the remaining address to be directed to all — frequently a discourse shifts from many to one or against them. The mother of Zebedee's sons asked that her two sons sit, one at the right and one at the left — the Lord responding directed the discourse to her sons, saying "Can you drink the cup that I am about to drink?" And if the evangelical text is carefully examined, the very conversion of the address attests that not every address was to all — for Matthew says that first and second he interrogated the disciples in common, then the address turns to Peter — and again turns to the disciples: for it is subjoined "then he commanded his disciples that they say to no one that he was Jesus, etc."

Nor does it avail that the Lord's reply is common to Peter and others by reason of the occasion of the common interrogation — since with this commonality it stands that the reply is appropriate to Peter; for in the greater cause of the common temptation, only Peter's ratio was had — as the Lord himself testifies in Luke 22, saying "Simon, behold, Satan has asked to sift you as wheat — but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail — and you, once converted, confirm your brothers." By

which it is evident all were assailed by Satan, and yet the Lord prayed for Peter alone and commended others to Peter. Therefore it is no obstacle that the common interrogation takes up the address — for that address is appropriate to Peter, since in the greater cause the commonality was had by the sole ratio of Peter.

**To the second objection** it is said: that Peter bore the common person, or responded for all, can be understood triply — either from office, because he has care of them; or by way of commission, because the apostles commissioned him to respond in the person of all; or by way of ratification, because the response given by Peter was agreeable to and accepted by all as common. And indeed that Peter did not bear the common person from office appears because he was not yet constituted their pastor, nor was he properly their head except as the first among canonically constituted ones, he can be called head of the canonical. Similarly that he did not respond from the commission of the apostles is clear not only because such commission is voluntarily affirmed but because Scripture expressly testifies that the Lord excluded it all — for it is related that the first interrogation of the disciples (who do men say the Son of man is?) the response was common; the evangelist says and they said. In the second interrogation of the same (but who do you say that I am?) the response was proper to Peter; the evangelist says: answering Simon Peter said. And it is confirmed again from John 6 chapter. Where we can clearly note the difference between Peter speaking in the person of all or in his own proper person: for there speaking

in the person of all Christ the Lord saying "will you also go away?" responded in the plural "Lord, to whom shall we go? We have words of eternal life and we believe and know that you are the Christ the Son of God." And the evangelist subjoins: "Jesus answered them: have I not chosen you twelve? And one of you is a devil?" Where comparing the Johannine text with Matthew's text, it appears clearly that then when Peter at John responded in the person of all, he spoke in the plural first, saying "to whom shall we go? We believe and know" — and similarly the Lord responded not to Peter but to them. Here however in Matthew all things are in the singular pronoun of Peter alone, both in Peter's response and in the Lord's replication and promises and assertions: "I say to you, I will give to you, not to you all, whatever you shall have bound, you are Peter, not you all are Peter" — as is clear in the letter. Such difference in the text manifests that Peter from the reasons had from the celestial Father alone responded — shown and distinguished from others by Christ. Nor think therefore that this is the same reading in Matthew and John — for this reading of Matthew was after the miracle of the five loaves and in the vicinity of Caesarea Philippi.

It must be said therefore that Peter's response as agreeable and acceptable to all is said to have been in the person of all — not from office or commission of all, but from the unity of all — because namely all were brothers, and the first responded excellently, the unity of all is pleased, as between united and unanimous brothers, what is said by one is held as said by all and as by all said is received.

And from this the response to the subjunction appears: for from this that Christ approved and commended Peter's response, and blest Peter, and promised him so much — it appears that it would be vain to expect the others to be heard; for who else would have said what was divinely revealed and thus remunerated appears? Whence the others did not remain as non-respondents, because Peter's response sufficed. And further Peter's response is insinuated to the other apostles as gratifying — not only from this, because it was spontaneous and according to human custom, but from the subjoined words of the evangelist: "then he commanded his disciples that they say to no one that he was Jesus." This precept shows that the disciples held Peter's confession — for therefore lest to others they say, they have the precept.

**To the third** it is said: that if the argument tended to the conclusion that the promises of the keys were made to all the apostles by these words, it seeks the principle — for this is what must be proved. But if it tends that through other words the Lord gave to the apostles the keys, it pertains to the following chapter where this will be treated.

**To the fourth** it is said: that the authority that "what I say to one, I say to all" is found nowhere in the Gospel to be given to the Lord. And even if it were found, it would be said universally to teach doctrinally — as Mark testifies in a similar chapter 13 which says: "and what I say to you I say to all: watch."

---

---

## CHAPTER FIVE

### *That the Other Apostles Were Not Given the Same Power which was Conferred on Peter*

---

Although many grant that the evangelical text of Matthew 16 pertains to Peter alone, they affirm nevertheless that all that was promised to Peter was given by Christ elsewhere to the other apostles — and therefore they affirm this with many arguments from sacred scripture.

**First:** Matthew 18 says to the apostles in common: "Whatever you shall have bound on earth will be bound in heaven, and whatever you shall have loosed on earth will be loosed in heaven." Here the power first promised to Peter appears extended to all.

**Second:** John 20 exhibits the keys to the apostles in common — saying also "whose sins you shall have forgiven they are forgiven, and whose you shall have retained they are retained."

**Third:** John 20 says to all the apostles in common: "As the Father sent me, so I send you." And similarly Mark at the end and Matthew at the end sent all in common to preach and baptize, etc. And then from deeds it is manifested the same — for Acts 8, Peter was sent with John by the apostles who were at

Jerusalem into Samaria. Acts 15, in the synod concerning the observance of legal matters, James with the present Peter gave the sentence, saying "I judge not to disturb them, etc." And Galatians 2 likewise: Peter, James, and John who appeared to be columns gave the right hand of fellowship to Paul and Barnabas. From which deeds the equality of Peter and the other apostles is proved.

Then a thousand authorities of the saints are brought — sounding the equality of Peter and the other apostles — as that of Cyprian, and the one held in distinction 24, chapter 1, where the Lord is said to give equal power to all the apostles, and yet that he might manifest the unity of the same unity's origin, disposed beginning from one authority: this is that the other apostles had the same that Peter had, with equal fellowship of honor and power; but the beginning is proficiscit from unity so that the Church of Christ may be shown as one. Whence not one but unity received the keys: as is also attested by chapters universal, and whatever-24, question 1, from Jerome and Augustine.

**To understand these:** it must be known that one is said by the saints, namely that Peter signified the Church when he received the keys. Two things can be deduced or said from this. The first is that the Church received the keys because Peter received the keys. The second is that the person of Peter did not receive the keys. Whence dupliciter contingit to err here: either denying the first or affirming the second. And to deny indeed that Peter signified the Church is to contradict the exposition of the saints. But to affirm that the

Church so received the keys because the person of Peter did not receive them, is an error more than heretical — because the evangelical history is thereby denied, and the history turned into parable. For I said before: that all the history of the Old Testament also turns into parable. I declare singula: for if to Peter not in his own proper person but only in the signified person of the Church the keys are promised, since it is said to him "And I will give you the keys, etc." — parabolic Peter is introduced, and not a history narrated; since parable is not had for the person of the one acting, but for the person of the one signified. And by the same license by which this history turns into parable, all other history — not only new but even of the old testament — can turn into parable; for it is written: "all things happened to them in figure," etc.

But the true and proven sentence is that something is signified doubly: one way by way of parable, as the prodigal son signifies a sinner, and the hired workers of the vineyard signify cultivators of God in Christ's Church, and so on. The other way by way of the thing done — so that what truly happened signifies another thing: as the passage of the Hebrews through the Red Sea signifies our passage from vices to virtue, and the coming of the Magi adoring Christ signifies the progress of travelers to the heavenly homeland. Between these modes of signifying, the disparity for the present purpose is: that in parabolic signification there is no care for the signifying persons according to themselves — but only to describe according to the thing to be signified, as is done among poets in comedies and tragedies. But when the thing done

signifies — first all care must be had for the thing transacted and for the persons according to themselves, because the literal sense consists in this; from this alone according to Dionysius and Augustine efficacious argument is drawn. Whence it is necessary first to verify in histories the things done, and what is said of persons according to themselves for the truth of faith — and then can be superadded a spiritual sense by which the thing done signifies another, by which the historic person figures something else — and this for the edification of Christ's faithful, not to prove those things of faith which come into controversy.

Wherefore it is necessary first to maintain the literal historic sense — that the person of Peter is spoken of, the promise made to him — and it is allowed thereafter to superadd the mystical sense by which Peter figures the Church, as appears in similar things in the signification of the active life by Martha, and of the contemplative by Mary to whom it is said "Martha, Martha, you are anxious and troubled about many things, and Mary has chosen the better part," etc., and so on. It is evident therefore that to Peter in the person of the Church the keys are promised — and it is true so that to the person of Simon himself first and at the letter they are promised — since that is verified according to the literal sense; and this according to the mystical sense. And to receive both modes the way of reading the sentence is necessary to presuppose this prior truth *ad litteram*: that Peter alone received the keys. For the signification indeed attending — since this signification is not by way of parable but by way of thing done — the one historic

true fact must be expressed that Peter alone according to history received the keys, so that one Peter's first receiving them might signify the unity of the Church receiving the keys. Whence the figurative Petrus is introduced and not the history narrated, if Petrus in his own proper person around the keys does not accept them, but parabolic; and since Petrus figuring the Church accepted the keys in his figure, it is necessary and true to say: Peter alone according to history accepted the keys — so that from the thing done it might be signified that one sole Catholic Church has the keys; according to that word of both: Peter who is one figures the unity of the Catholic Church. And to the initiation attending — since with the cause of the initiation the dependence is not of signification from the signifying, but of the real dependence from the cause — since the body depends on the head and rests in its head: therefore to say truly that the universal Church received the keys as inchoated in Peter — it is necessary and true that Peter alone according to history received the keys — so that Peter alone truly received them in his own person, since the Church as his whole body received them in him as its head. Therefore from Peter alone receiving the keys it is inferred that the Church inchoated and signified received the keys; so that truly one whole body — the entire Church — is under one head.

Do not be deceived by the ancient sophistication of schismatics among Catholics pretending as monstrous — when we say the head of the Church is Peter — since Christ is head of the body of the Church (as is said at Colossians 1) and if Peter is also posited as

head of the Church, two heads are joined to one body not without something monstrous. These things are trivial — since Peter is called head of the Church by another reason than Christ is head of the Church. For Christ is head simply by reason of himself; Peter however by reason of Christ. Whence Christ is simply and absolutely head; Peter however is head, because he is vicar-head — he is the second in the place of Christ ruling in the heavens, head in the earth. Whence the entire ecclesiastical body has one single head simply and absolutely — that is Christ — in whose place on earth Peter is constituted not another head but vicar-head. Whence no monstrosity intervenes in the ecclesiastical body — unless for those who refuse to understand ecclesiastical names in the sense in which they are used, which is manifest to almost all.

**From these** it must be clearly visible: among all the discussed positions, the first affirmed justice's quality, denied the substance of the person. The second from the affirmed Church signified, denied Peter's person signifying. The third from affirmed Peter's principality denied its singularity. The fourth from the affirmed common equal apostolate denied the unity of the pastoral office in Peter. The fifth from the affirmed keys of the Church denied Peter alone receiving the keys. The sixth from the affirmed sole head of the Church Christ, denied Peter to be head in place of Christ. And the like you will find below when It is established therefore that to Peter alone were promised the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that is, the power of opening and closing the kingdom of heaven absolutely. When Christ then descended to

partial acts — binding and loosing in Matthew 18, forgiving and retaining sins in John 20 — he communicated these lesser acts to the apostles as well. But the total and adequate power of the keys, the opening and closing of heaven itself, was promised and given to Peter alone. Hence the authorities of the saints sounding equality of the apostles are to be understood of apostolic authority insofar as they were apostles — that is, of equal dignity and power in their apostolate — not of the pastoral office over the whole Church, which is Peter's singular prerogative. Peter had apostolic authority as all others had it, and beyond that was constituted ordinary pastor of the entire flock of Christ. These two things are distinct: having the keys as an apostle, and having the keys as universal pastor. The former the others shared; the latter belongs to Peter alone.

---

## CHAPTER SIX

### *That Peter Alone Receiving the Keys Is Consistent with the Church Having Received the Keys*

---

After the preceding has been established, it falls to us to satisfy those who ask how these two stand together: Peter alone received the keys, and the Church received the keys. For it appears that if Peter alone received the keys, therefore not the Church; and if the Church, therefore not Peter alone. And the

question is enlarged by Augustine's words recited above from distinction 24, question 1 — "whatever you shall have bound on earth will be bound in heaven" — if this was said to Peter alone, the Church does not do this; if however the Church does this, then it received the keys as Peter received them, understanding the Church received the keys insofar as Peter received them, signifying the Church.

To this question satisfaction can easily be found by exercising in sacred letters and sciences. These two truths are thus connected: the second not only consents with the first but presupposes and depends on the first — according to the teaching of the saints.

Consider that the Catholic Church is doubly referable to Peter: namely as signified and as inchoated. For Peter both signified the universal Church and inchoated the same — as the principal member of a body is. Between these two however there is a twofold relevant difference: the first is that signification pertains to the mystical sense (by which Peter signifies the Church), while the inchoation pertains to the literal sense (by which Peter was constituted pastor of the whole Church as the constituted head). The second difference is that in signification the dependence is not of the reality from the reality, but of the signification from the signifying — attending to the signification mode: since with whatever figurative condition Petrus bears the Church's person, he extends to the universal Church as figurative pastor's office — whence since pastoral office pertains to him by virtue of the propriety of figurative pastoral office, in figure of the Church. Whence it is

inferred that not one received the keys but unity — that is to say: unity of the keys is received, truly as it is true that the Church received the keys; since unity of the Church in Christ's one Petrus Clavier signifies the unity of the Church, and the universal Church represents. The inchoation however pertains to the real dependence of the reality from reality — that is of the body from the head: therefore the Church simply received the keys from Peter as one who inchoated them — that is as one who founded and inaugurated the receiving; just as the body receives in its head and through its head. Thus the universal Church received the keys as signified and inchoated in Peter.

---

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### *That the Pontificate of the Whole Church Was Promised to Peter in the Preceding Promises*

---

That four promises were made to Peter by the Lord Matthew the evangelist relates in the above-cited words — of which the two last (whatever you shall have bound, and whatever you shall have loosed) were also communicated to the other apostles; the first two (upon this rock I will build my church, and I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven) properly persevered with Peter.

In these promises the pontificate of the whole Church committed to Peter is to be declared — after both promises have been more fully elucidated.

In the first promise, six things are to be noted for more significant understanding: first, "my Church" — not my churches; second, "my Church" — not some church of mine; third, "my Church" — not every church of mine; fourth, "my Church" — not indefinitely; fifth, "my Church" — singularly or uniquely; sixth, "my Church" — without any addition. Attend to each singly. He did not say "my churches" but "my Church" — that one Church might be signified which comprehends many partial churches, not therefore dividing or multiplying the Church but with numerical unity retaining many parts, as one body has many members, according to the Apostle's word at Colossians 1: she is one body of the dove. He said "my Church" — not "some church of mine" — not of a part of the church, not of any particular church but of the integrated or total Church in its entirety. For it did not befit divine wisdom to build some particular church upon one Peter and some other; God's works are indeed perfect. He said "my Church" — not indefinitely, leaving the intellect to seek what it might be, the Church of Christ to be built upon this rock — just as he left the intellect uncertain when at supper he said "one of you will betray me." He said "my Church" to signify uniquely and solely that one Church (of which in the Creed it is said "one holy Catholic Church") that you understand from the sole pronoun "my" to determine the one unique sole whole Church of Christ that is to be built — since the Creed in the article of faith has determined it to be

one sole Catholic Church. And therefore what you are to understand through "my Church" is: that sole unique total Catholic Church. Do not lack sophistical importunities from the fact that any particular church is truly Christ's Church — arguing: of that church Christ speaks from which it is verified that it is "my Church"; but of any particular church it is verified that it is "my Church" — therefore Christ speaks when he says "upon this rock I will build my church" of any particular church. The fallacy of this argument can easily be detected — by attending to the thing and saying that any particular church is indeed Christ's Church, but not total, nor without some addition, but such — say the Milanese — and not so that it is the Church without some addition. But Christ speaks of the integral Church — which is not such a Church, nor any particular church, but absolutely and simply "the Church." Nothing prevents the mode by which any particular church is Christ's Church (since it is a part of Christ's Church), from verifying equally of any particular church what is said "it will be built upon this rock" — since it is built as part. So that the mode by which it is verified of the particular church that it is "my Church" — in the same mode it is verified that it is "built upon this rock." Whence since any particular church is Christ's Church as a part of the Catholic Church, by the same reason any particular church is built upon this rock as a part. And so the word of Christ in the literal sense is understood of one Catholic Church: by reason of which it is understood that any particular church as a part of the Catholic Church can be called by Christ "my Church," and equally built upon this rock as part. The mode therefore by which it is verified of the particular

church that it is "my Church" is in the same mode verified of the one that is built upon this rock. This is different from the Catholic Church in that the Catholic Church is built upon this rock as a whole, while any particular church is built upon this rock as a part. Whence therefore by proper designation the Catholic Church is the one built upon this rock — of which alone at the letter Christ speaks, saying "upon this rock I will build my church" — in which nevertheless all parts of Christ's partial churches are enclosed as parts in the whole. The Roman Church differs from other partial churches by proximity to the head of the Catholic Church — since the Roman Church in her own proper head is not only proximate but is the same as the head of the Catholic Church: since by the same deed Peter became Roman Pontiff and Pontiff of the Catholic Church. Any other partial church does not directly join by itself to the pastor of the Catholic Church, nor does its head coincide with the head of the Catholic Church. On account of this therefore priority and conjunction of the Roman Church to the pastor of the Catholic Church — the words of Christ are appropriated to the Roman Church rather than to others — not because they are proper to the Roman Church, but of the Catholic Church as was said. The Lord therefore promised to Peter by this first promise: "upon this rock I will build my church" — to be the future foundation of the Catholic Church itself.

By the second promise (I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven) the fullness of ecclesiastical power was promised — which is manifested in three ways. First from the very thing signified by the keys of

the kingdom of heaven: the power of opening and closing the heavens absolutely, comprehending all wayfarers, by whom the kingdom of heaven can be opened or closed to anyone. Such power comprehends a fourfold genus of power: judicial power both in the forum of penitence and in the ecclesiastical forum (since every ecclesiastical judge of either forum, by loosing or binding, opens or closes the kingdom of heaven to those who are loosed or bound); also the governing power of the Catholic Church (since by providing, governing, instituting, disposing, etc., nothing else is done except to open or close the kingdom of heaven — since such direction is of men to the kingdom of heaven, and opening the way to it); also power extending to purgatory — where it is to be noted that although Christ did not give Peter judicial power over purgatory, he nevertheless gave him the keys of the kingdom of heaven (for the opening and closing to those in purgatory) and therefore also by judicial power in relation to the living it exempts from purgatory those whom it looses; while speaking of the keys of the kingdom of heaven he exempts no wayfarer to whom through the Church the kingdom of heaven is able to be opened or closed — *loquens de clavibus regni coelorum, nullum eximit viatorem, cui per ecclesiam potest aperiri uel claudi regnum coelorum*. And therefore saying absolutely "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven" said absolutely and illimitably that he would give Petro the power of opening and closing the kingdom of heaven to any wayfarer positively — to close negatively at least. These things however said in no way deny or diminish the powers of Augustine, sacred canons, or pontiffs Peter's power

extend even to the dead he is said to defend — since what we said confirms this. For the ecclesiastical censure in the dead as long as it loosens or binds, pertains to what is above the earth, that is to the living — namely those who are bound lest they communicate, or are loosed that they may communicate with the dead; while as far as it opens or closes the kingdom of heaven to the souls of the dead, truly hence opens or closes the kingdom of heaven. The judicial power in this way is terminated above the earth; the keys however of the kingdom of heaven extend to all wayfarers. The imperative power then to all things relating to the Church in any way in order to the kingdom of heaven requires the right reason that the power which arrived at the summit is with its other powers — since these were given to be the ways to the one end.

---

## CHAPTER EIGHT

*That What Is Said to Peter's Person — Though  
Qualified by Charity — Is "Feed My Sheep"*

---

With the treatment of the promises made to Peter alone by the Lord at Matthew now complete, we must turn to the commission the Savior gave Peter at John 21, when he so many times said to him: "Feed my sheep." Here, just as in the foregoing four matters,

two things occur: first, that these words were said to Peter's person alone, so that no similar words were said to any other — and this means the whole Church was committed to Peter; second, that this pontificate of the Catholic Church was given to Peter by this.

Since one who does not know how to untie a knot cannot solve a difficulty, the things to be brought forward from these two must be stated. From the first two it appears that it was said not simply but to the qualified person: "Feed my sheep."

**First:** from Peter's renaming: he is called Simon John — this signifies obedient grace; for not without reason (as Bede says here) did the Lord call him thus, but to insinuate this mystery.

**Second:** from the triple interrogation "Do you love me?" — where he manifestly said to the one who loves: "Feed my sheep." From these it appears that it was said not simply but to the qualified person of one obedient to divine grace and love of Christ himself: "Feed my sheep."

Here it must be observed that we walk a middle way and avoid both extremes. For in dealing with the qualified person's office, four things occur: person, his quality, use of the office, and rectitude of use. Though these are all distinct, heretics unwilling to distinguish between use of power and rectitude of use attribute everything to quality — and thus more extensively erring, they arrogate ecclesiastical power to any just person. Many others on the other hand (of whom the number is infinite) demeaning rectitude of use — if they attribute ecclesiastical power to the

person, whatever happens regarding the quality of charity they think sufficient. But the right and Catholic reasoning embraces the middle way: judging that ecclesiastical power is given and must be given to the qualified person, yet so that the person's power — or the use of power — responds to the quality, while the rectitude of use responds to the quality. Thus both errors are avoided: while wisely the qualified person is entrusted with the ministry so that it may use the ecclesiastical ministry rightly — and if it happens that there are evil ministers, the Church is not subject to ambiguity or danger of fallacy, but through evil ones it accepts good things. And if wise wisdom ought by any means to commit a qualified person's rectitude of use of office — this above all befitted incarnate wisdom; and therefore thirdly it exacts the quality of charity from Peter in committing to him the best act: so that exact charity looks to the goodness of the act, and the goodness of the act is attributed to charity; as all doctors commonly sound. And the best act is manifestly committed by the Savior to Peter saying "Feed my sheep" — from each of the three utterances; for to feed is to confer nourishment by which sheep are nourished, increased, multiplied, and live. He said sheep — not goats, not oxen, not wolves, and such manner of men as the luxurious, proud, rapacious, envious, slanderers, etc. He added "my" — so that with his own love subtracted, the ratio of Christ's love for feeding the sheep signified explicitly. From which three things joined together it is clear that he was committing the best act to Peter saying "Feed my sheep" — and since (as has been said) the best act cannot come except from Christ's charity, therefore it is committed to the person qualified by

charity from the Lord. From this however it does not follow (as heretics pretend) that the pastoral office is committed to the quality — but rather that charity is committed the goodness or rectitude of use of the pastoral office; while the use itself is understood to be committed to the person. And therefore the Lord in this place three times exacting charity did not say: your charity shall feed my sheep — but he thrice addresses the person saying: "Feed you my lambs" or "my sheep." And just as in Matthew the person of Peter is described by his proper name and by the name of his carnal father, and by the grace of internal revelation of the soul — so that from these things proper to Peter we might understand that the person of Peter is that one to whom Christ said "feed my sheep" — so also in this place not once but three times, by his proper name and by his carnal father's person according to the flesh, Simon John or Jonah (as the more correct codices have it) and according to the soul from his own humiliation by which he submits his heart to Christ's knowledge — three times repeating: "Lord, you know that I love you." And from his own grief Peter was saddened, etc. — so that from these things proper to Peter we might openly understand that person of Peter is the one to whom Christ said: "Feed my sheep." And since Christ said not "by the gift of charity" but committed the pastoral office by addressing the person — we understand by it that not by a gift of charity but by the person committed is the pastoral office to be perceived; and from exact charity we understand that rectitude of use of the pastoral office is committed to charity — for no one without charity can rightly use the pastoral office. And these things are according to

the literal evangelical sense. As for the mystical sense (from which efficacious argument cannot be drawn): Simon John signifies obedient grace.

**Exclusion of objections.** It is evident therefore that Christ did not say to the quality but to the qualified person of Peter qualified by charity: "Feed my sheep" — and consequently if Peter had departed from charity he would not have lost the pastoral office but the rectitude of its use, since from charity depends not the office but the rectitude of use: as is clear among any Catholic doctor, and only heretics have contradictors.

---

## CHAPTER NINE

*That "Feed My Sheep" Was Said to Peter Alone, Not  
in the Same Way to the Other Apostles*

---

That it was said by Christ to Peter alone to feed his sheep — the text itself clearly manifests: from his proper name and his carnal father's thrice repeated; from the comparison added to the others: "Do you love me more than these?" — the comparative diversity shows of those very apostles present to whom he is compared; from Peter's own passion, described as saddened from the third interrogation mindful of the denial of Christ formerly predicted to him when he was prepared to die — so that no room

for doubt is left. And since these things were given to Peter after the Lord's resurrection — and to the other apostles neither before nor after is anything similar found said — it remains that to Peter alone was said: "Feed my sheep."

Nor does it prevent the Church calling all apostles pastors of the Lord's flock in the preface ("whom you willed to constitute pastors continually of your works") — since this manifestly refers to the apostolate; and therefore pastors of the Lord's flock are called in the way pastoral care pertains to the apostolate — as apostolic exercise attests pastoral care of Christ's legates. And thus Peter (as will be clear from what has been said and what will be said) was constituted as the ordinary pastor even of the apostles themselves — and this is what Christ's words signify: "Feed my sheep."

---

## CHAPTER TEN

*That the Universal Church Was Committed to Peter Alone by These Words of Christ: "Feed My Sheep"*

---

That the universal Church was committed to Peter by these words is put in sophistic doubt from six arguments.

**First:** because he did not say "Feed all my sheep" — for if the whole Church were comprehended, it ought to have been said "all sheep," as it is said "teach all nations" at the end of Matthew.

**Second:** because nothing impossible was committed by Christ — but to feed all Christ's sheep throughout the world from one is impossible. And if it is said that one could feed the whole world through others: on the contrary, the Lord said "feed" and did not say "have it fed" — even an Ethnic could do this.

**Third:** because Peter would sin if he alone had not pastured, if all alone were committed to him.

**Fourth:** because Peter sent no apostle, and any apostle ordained bishops without Peter's authority.

**Fifth:** because we consider the apostles distributed to various parts of the world as their portions.

**Sixth:** because Peter received only the sheep of the circumcision, as is clear at Galatians 2, where Paul says: "when they saw that I was entrusted with the gospel of the uncircumcision as Peter with that of the circumcision — for he who worked through Peter for his apostolate of the circumcision worked also through me for the gentiles."

What manifestly departs from the true evangelical sense is not difficult to open. For saying "feed my sheep" — it is necessary that either all, or these, or none, or vaguely the sheep be committed to be fed. And indeed that not these or those determined — the very words testify; that truly none — is contrary to

truth; and that vaguely relics — derogates Christ's wisdom and conflicts with the truth of the added pronoun, and is contrary to the understanding of the holy name added. It is established therefore from this alone that from the sole pronoun "my" — the sheep of Christ are designated not vaguely, not indefinitely, but so that no sheep comprehended under the pronoun "my" is left out. And note the perverseness of expounding: when at Matthew it is said "upon this rock I will build my church" — those who think all Christ's churches are to be understood thereby refuse to confess one sole church built upon the rock; while here when to Peter is said at John "feed my sheep" — indefinitely they expound, lest Christ's sheep under one pastor should be comprehended. Whereas on the contrary the ecclesiastical sense: just as there one Catholic Church is understood such that all Christ's particular churches are contained therein as parts in the whole — so here Christ's sheep are so understood, explicitly explained by the pronoun "my," that no sheep comprehended under the pronoun "my" is left out. And therefore it was not necessary to add "all" — since any sheep to which the pronoun "my" extends are comprehended when it is said "feed my sheep"; just as at John 10, all are comprehended as Christ's sheep when the Lord said "I lay down my life for my sheep" — and again "my sheep hear my voice and I know them and they follow me and I give them eternal life and they shall not perish forever and no one shall snatch them from my hand." Hence it necessarily appears that the universal sign supplies the effect of a higher reason — and therefore it is not similar judgment of this text and that one of "teach all nations"; for there his own sheep he committed to

one feeding sufficiently through "my" comprehending all — and this by reason and testimony of scripture is shown most clearly to consist from the same evangelist.

And the Catholic sense is confirmed here: since what Christ there promised, here he exhibited; and because there he promised the whole Church, here he committed all sheep. And it is confirmed again from the Lord's words at John 10: "other sheep I have which are not of this fold; them also I must bring and there shall be one flock and one shepherd" — if from all sheep one flock ought to consist under one shepherd, it follows that when one shepherd is instituted — and it is said: "Feed my sheep" — of that one flock's care it is committed. It would be doubtful indeed if Christ had many sheepfolds, of which he would speak when speaking of his sheep — since he himself testifies he has one flock, it cannot be doubted of which sheep he commits care: unless one is foolish enough before God to commit care of part of the flock. And this sense is confirmed again here from the exposition of the saints: whose authorities more broadly will be set out below.

**To the first argument:** It was not necessary to add "all" — since any sheep to which the pronoun "my" extends are comprehended when it is said "feed my sheep"; and therefore Theophylus here says: "Finished, the commission of the world's sheep is commended to Peter, not others."

**To the second:** It is not impossible but necessary and useful that all Christ's sheep be pastured by one as the head of the Catholic Church. In this mode of

feeding — it is closed by the head of the Catholic Church — that Christ's sheep of diverse assisting members are pastured by the head: as the whole body is ruled by the head with assisting other members. Whence it is not to be said Peter feeds, i.e. himself alone makes to feed — but that he as head through other co-members assisting feeds all Christ's sheep: which cannot be done through a lay prince or any other who is not the head of the Church. So much the more possible is it for Peter to feed all Christ's sheep, as much as Peter is the vicar of Christ living, reigning, and assisting to direct, inspire, and help. Whence the solution of the third objection appears: for it is committed to Peter alone — not so that alone in every way he pastured, but so that alone as head of the Catholic Church he feeds all Christ's sheep — and therefore he does not sin if through co-members he is assisted to feeding Christ's sheep, but would sin if he sustained a co-head of the Catholic Church.

**To the fourth:** it is said Peter sent no apostle — because he was anticipated by Christ the Lord, who sent the apostles at John 20: "as the Father has sent me, so I send you." And therefore the apostolate authority could ordain bishops without a faculty had from Peter.

**To the fifth:** it is said that the distribution of the apostles pertains to execution of the apostolate — and nothing at all prevents the pastoral office of Peter; since his authority is not thereby diminished from this that Christ sent the apostles, since this pertains to the legation — and that other to execution. And by this the sixth objection is also

resolved: for insofar as Paul speaks of apostolate execution, Paul says it was worked through him for the gentiles. With these various executions the unity of pastoral care evidently stands with Peter.

---

## CHAPTER ELEVEN

*That by These Words "Feed My Sheep," the Pontificate of the Whole Church Was Committed to Peter by Christ*

---

Some deny that the pontificate of the whole Church was conferred on Peter by these words.

**First:** because to feed does not signify to be first or to be the head.

**Second:** because Christ's word is either hortatory or preceptory for feeding, not for subjecting the sheep.

**Reply:** It is not difficult to show the pontificate given under these words. To feed Christ's sheep — is the act of authority in feeding, of utility in the sheep, of end in Christ. From this very fact that Christ committed his sheep as sheep to be fed to Peter — it is manifestly clear in midday light that he made Peter above the others as pastor of the sheep. No one through a lay prince or anyone else who is not the head of the Church can do this, as is shown.

Therefore another place need not be sought where power was given Peter over the Church — since this place attests it given — unless one is so foolish as to think it said to Peter: "Feed my sheep" not in the office of pastor but in the office of a hired hand.

Which foolishness is also refuted from the triple exaction of Christ's charity from Peter: for to him who loves Christ's sheep are committed to be fed — far removed is mercenary love. Whence also if to feed does not signify to be the principal — it nonetheless signifies the act of an ecclesiastical prince; and again if it does not signify to be the principal, it nonetheless presupposes the principate since it presupposes a pastor. Whence it is well responded that to feed cannot occur except by a superior to whom it is given to feed. And when it is said "what to me? seek the place where words are conferring power over the Church" — much is responded truly from the very ratio of connected things: for if to feed cannot occur except by a superior — to whom it is given to feed, it is given also to be a superior — hence from this text it is also clear that another place of scripture is not to be sought where Peter is made head over the Church: since this is clear here.

**We affirm moreover** that Christ's word is preceptory — for to the apostle Paul, "woe to me if I do not evangelize" — much more to Peter, "woe to him if he has not pastured Christ's sheep." But not only preceptory is Christ's word, but also institutory: for if in the condition of the first part of the word of God he instituted the principal creatures and simultaneously commanded their own proper work

(according to that: "he established it forever and forever, he gave a command and it will not pass away") — it is fitting that in the creation of the Christian Church its first member he perfected by the same word — commanding the supreme pontificate's work and instituting the pontificate itself. For by this very fact that to Peter it is committed to feed Christ's sheep — the Christian people as sheep are commanded to conduct themselves toward Peter: for it would be vain to commit sheep to be fed by Peter, unless as sheep they were exhibited to him by the common Lord. Whence the necessity not only of pasturing but of subjection is signified in the Lord's words when he says: "Feed my sheep." And Augustine here expounding: to feed means not only to teach but to rule — while he says the very sheep are to be fed, meaning taught and ruled; and he commits them and Chrysostom: "Feed my sheep, take up the care of the brothers" — and the Gloss from Alcuin: "to feed sheep and believers in Christ, lest they fall away from faith, to strengthen — to provide earthly subsidies to subjects if necessity demands, to impede with the word of preaching, to repel adversaries, to correct wandering subjects."

So even if to feed does not signify to be the principal — it nonetheless means to rule Christ's sheep: in which is enclosed to be the principal; even if it does not signify to be the principal, yet it draws the principate with it — just as it draws with it to require, reduce, bind, consolidate, protect and heal: of which the Lord is mindful at Ezekiel 34. And hence Peter is called prince of the apostles and prince over the people of Christ — and according to Gregory's words

to Maurice: care of the whole Church and the principate is committed to him.

And if it is asked why the Lord committed the pontificate to Peter not under the vocabulary of prelacy or authority or dignity, but of the act of feeding his sheep: the ready reason is: both from the side of the matter — because the prelacy or authority is for the sake of feeding Christ's sheep and not against; and from the side of regulating the appetite — because not a place of dignity or authority is to be sought or aspired to in the pontificate: but the pasture of Christ's sheep is to be sought in the pontificate, according to that which the Apostle afterwards said: "Whoever desires the episcopate desires a good work." And from the side of scripture to be fulfilled: for he had said before the passion at Luke 22 "the kings of the nations lord it over them, and those who exercise authority over them are called benefactors: but you are not so, but let the greatest among you become as the least." Hence from this ministerial act of feeding Christ's sheep, he signified the pontificate tacitly as annexed and not to be estimated except for the utility of Christ's sheep: the opposite of which happens in the kings and lords of the nations, who ordain all things to this end that they may rule and be lords.

Furthermore among pontifical acts, the principal work of Peter is shown to be the pontificate: to feed the elect is the chief of pontifical acts. For just as to the supreme part of divine providence pertains the care of the elect (for whose happiness not only the motion of the heavens was ordered — as John

testifies at Apocalypse chapter 6 saying to them that they should rest a little while until the number of their fellow servants was completed — but he himself also descended from the heavens and was made man, crucified, dead, buried, and the rest — all things sustained for the elect) — so to the supreme ecclesiastical care which we call the pontificate, it is fitting to feed the elect. It is established moreover that only the elect are signified when it says "feed my sheep" — as the very Lord witnesses at John 10, saying: "my sheep hear my voice and I know them and they follow me and I give them eternal life and they shall not perish forever." Nor therefore is Peter's pontificate as it were restricted to the sole elect — but subordinated to the elect's pasture; from this is the whole of the rest of the pontifical acts. For just as according to the universal order one motion of the heavens is for filling the number of the elect — and the same however also extends itself to propagating the non-elect; and according to the order of grace the supreme good pastor Christ put his life for his sheep, that is for the elect — and yet the same death was for the life of the whole world: so in sacred mysteries the supreme pontificate on account of feeding the elect — and the same also comprehends the non-elect. Nor wrongly — since of the same is the care, end and disposition of those who are for the end; now the life of the elect is the end of the governance of the others.

All things I endure says the apostle at 2 Timothy 2 for the elect; and at Romans 8 all things given to the elect are attested; and over all the Lord's goods to be constituted are affirmed the elect at Matthew 23. Nor do I pass over in silence those foreknown as damned:

since under the name of lambs to comprehend some of the foreknown is not unsuitable; for there are many imperfect Christians always learning and never arriving at the perfection of a sheep; whom the Lord committed to be fed simultaneously with the sheep: since he twice committed lambs and thirdly sheep — not only because the imperfect are in greater need of care, but so that by the very number diversity of his lambs, that is Christians, might be insinuated — of those living a common life, while some are reprobate, others elect: but sheep once and finally are committed — since all Christ's sheep are among the elect and the growing oration terminates at the highest. And when all are committed to Peter's pastoral care — only the lambs and sheep are to be fed: wolves however, lions and bears committed — to be guarded against, driven away, or exterminated. Whence no one is left exempt from Peter's pontificate — even if it had been committed to him alone: "feed my sheep" — on account of which all things are done as it were for those for whom all things cooperate for good: as the Apostle testifies at Romans 8.

Furthermore the excellence of this committed work is made more manifest by running through pontifical and pastoral works: for the six pastoral acts at Ezekiel 34 — namely to require what was lost, reduce what was cast away, bind what was broken, consolidate what was infirm, heal what was sick, protect what was fat and strong — to the pasture of sheep are ordered by the Lord, arguing against these pastors saying: "Woe to the pastors of Israel who pastured themselves — did not the flocks also pasture from the pastors? You ate the milk and clothed yourselves

with the wool and killed the fat — but the flocks you did not pastor, etc." Where the reason of the omission manifestly makes clear from this — that not sheep but themselves the evil pastors feed: as though the ratio of all these works were to vacate for feeding the very sheep. The judicial acts too which in the Church are done both in the forum of penitence and in the contentious forum — to feeding Christ's sheep to be ordered there is no doubt. To open finally and to close the kingdom of heaven pertains to the pasture of sheep so that to open the kingdom of heaven is to feed Christ's sheep; to close it however is ordered to the pasture of the same — since it is referred to the good of the elect for whom all things cooperate for good. It is established therefore if all the things signified by this promise "feed my sheep" are collected — committed to Peter to be the pontificate of the whole Church. And we have not coined these new things — but what we learned from the fathers, we set forth — confirming Peter's pontificate with trustworthy attestation as will be clear in the last chapter.

---

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### *That Peter Has by Christ's Institution a Successor in the Pontificate of the Catholic Church*

---

With Peter's pontificate of the Catholic Church confirmed, we must treat of its successor. And so that the difference between Catholics and schismatics may be manifestly understood, it must be prenotated in what we agree and in what we disagree: concordantly we confess Peter to have been prince of the apostles, etc., and to have been Roman Pontiff, just as James the apostle was Pontiff of Jerusalem; and therefore any Roman bishop to be Peter's successor in the pontificate of the Roman Church — just as any Jerusalem bishop is Jacob's successor in the pontificate of the Jerusalem Church. Concordantly we also affirm the Jerusalem bishop does not succeed Jacob except in the Jerusalem episcopate — for he does not succeed Jacob in the authority of the apostolate. But we immediately disagree when they try to infer that the Roman Pontiff does not succeed Peter except in the pontificate of the Roman Church: for we Catholics affirm the Roman Pontiff to succeed Peter not only in the episcopate of the Roman Church but also in the pontificate of the Catholic Church —

Where if we have examined perspicaciously, we will see two things remaining to be treated: whether Peter

by divine right has a successor in the Pontificate of the Catholic Church, and whether such a successor is the Roman Pontiff. For schismatics deny the Roman Pontiff to be bishop of the Catholic Church, and they deny that by divine institution someone unique ought to succeed Peter in the governance of the whole Church; and before all else they deny that Peter was instituted by Christ Pontiff of the Catholic Church. Now that we have declared this pontificate of Peter: it remains first to treat whether he has any successor, and then finally whether that one is the Roman Pontiff.

And according to the prefixed mode of adducing arguments, the arguments by which against a unique successor of Peter in the pontificate of the Catholic Church are raised must be faced. It is argued therefore first from connected things: if these words of Christ to Peter — "I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven" at Matthew and "feed my sheep" at John 21 — extend to the successor, it is fitting that the words accompanying and subsequent to and preceding said by Christ to Peter also be understood as said not to Peter alone but also to the successor — but this is established to be false, as appears by going through individually. For at Matthew, the Lord prefaced: "you are Peter" — and then subjoined reproving Peter: "Get behind me Satan, for you do not savor the things of God" — similarly at John it is prefaced: "Do you love me more than these?" and similar accompanying things are interposed with Peter's responses — and afterwards is subjoined: "when you were younger you used to gird yourself, etc." Now nothing of these pertains to the successor

according to the literal sense: therefore neither those words: "I will give" and "feed my sheep" are said at the letter to Peter and the successor — but just as the rest mystically apply to successors, so do these.

**Second:** from similar instances. The words of Christ at Luke 22, "I have prayed for you, etc." are not said at the letter to Peter and the successor: therefore neither are these — "I will give the keys" and "feed my sheep" — said to Peter for himself and the successor. The consequence holds from the similar: especially since that text is brought forward by sacred doctors for the solidity of Peter's succession in faith.

**Third:** from other things said to the same Peter by the Lord — such as "before the cock crows you will deny me three times" at Matthew 26 and "go to the sea and cast the hook, etc." at Matthew 17 — why are such things thus said to Peter's proper person and the successor — that "I will give the keys" and "feed my sheep" refer to the successor? This appears voluntarily done.

**Fourth:** from omissions. Nowhere certainly did Christ say he speaks in those words to Peter for himself and the successor — whereas he ought to have taught this when this is proposed as one of the necessary credibles of the Church; and Isaiah himself said: "what more ought I to have done for my vineyard than I have not done" — if he did everything that was owed to the synagogue of the Jews, how much more did he do everything for the Christian Church.

**Confirmation.** And the argument is augmented from this that the Lord at Matthew 28 says: "behold I am with you all days to the consummation of the age." Where because he wished to certify himself to be in this whole time with the Church, he said: "behold I am with you all days to the consummation of the age" — and manifested that to the disciples for themselves and their successors he was speaking. Hence it is argued that if to Peter and the successor he had intended to say these things, he would have explained or insinuated the successor as he insinuated the successors of the disciples there.

**Fifth:** from co-apostles. What reason is there that none of the other apostles has a successor in the apostolate, while Peter alone has one? And again what reason is there that apostolic successors are bishops (who are established as equals: whence also they are called brothers) and one bishop only succeeds Peter over the whole Church? And again as has been done — what reason is sufficient that a Jerusalem bishop succeeds Jacob in the episcopate of that church but not in the apostolate — while a successor of Peter succeeds him in the apostolate and in the pontificate of the whole Church? For this seems to be done not by divine reason or will but human.

**Sixth:** Then it is argued by reducing to many inconveniences. And first: if Christ's word refers to Peter alone, therefore not to the successor — and again therefore with Peter the keys came and went. And the sequences are proved: because what is said of one only cannot pertain to many.

**Second:** because if it extends to the successor, therefore necessarily by ratio and to the other apostles — since they were then present and were successors of Peter's.

**Third:** because it would be ridiculous that all churches have the same baptism, the same eucharist, the same confirmation, the same word of God, the same priesthood, the same penitence, the same unction, the same matrimony, and the remaining sacraments, the same faith, hope, charity, grace, death, life, glory — and this single temporal power alone would be a successor of Peter through the word of God common to all.

**Fourth:** if one bishop by divine right is preferred to the rest — Jerome manifestly teaches heresy in the epistle to Evander which is held at distinction 93, chapter "legimus" — for not only himself but Peter, Paul, John, Luke whom he introduces as irrefragable authors teach it. For it is clear there that bishops are the same as presbyters, and bishops are equal.

**Fifth:** because the same Jerome, commenting on the epistle to Titus, and this is held at distinction 95, chapter "olim" — formerly says: just as priests are accustomed from the custom of the Church to be subject to the one set over them, so bishops should know themselves to be more by custom than by the truth of the Lord's dispensation over presbyters, and in common they ought to rule the Church. Therefore not by divine right is one Peter's successor bishop greater than others.

**To understand these matters:** it must be considered in a triple way, it is manifestly made that these Christ's words so many times repeated — "feed my sheep" — were said to Peter not only for himself but also for his successor.

**The first way:** from the very Lord's words when he said "feed my sheep" — he instituted one pastor of his sheep: as the very words testify — without further proof: for a pastor signifies an ordinary rector of sheep, as is clear both from the very names of pastor and sheep, and from the very ratio of feeding. Then because it is fitting that the one who ordinarily has the care of sheep — either be a hired hand or be a pastor: but he is not a hired hand — since when he sees the wolf coming he flees and it does not pertain to him about the sheep since he is a hired hand: as is said at John 10. It therefore follows that he who ordinarily has care of sheep is a pastor. It is established moreover that a pastor as an ordinary official is not terminated by the death of the one who exercised the pastoral office — but must endure by succession. And hence it is fitting that the institution of the pastor is the institution of the perpetual office — and through this what is given in the first institution to the pastor, is given to each successor in the same. Whence from this very fact that the Lord saying "feed my sheep" instituted a pastor of the whole Church — he established the pastoral office of the whole Church from then and forever — and what he then gave to Peter, signified himself to give to each of Peter's successors in Peter. Again saying "feed my sheep" — he showed perpetuity of the pastor to be understood from another text: for since he knew his sheep would

endure to the consummation of the age in one flock — saying "feed my sheep" — he provided for a pastor from then to the consummation of the age; and therefore by this very fact that saying "feed my sheep" he committed the care of one flock to him — he signified himself to provide for one pastor to the consummation of the age.

We therefore have doubly from the very evangelical words — that any Peter's successor was instituted as pastor of the whole Church in the very blessed Peter.

**The second way** proceeds from reasons founded on sacred scripture: partly because it is foolish to think Christ provided for his sheep in part of the time — and the least part, namely that in which Peter lived; and not for the whole and so long a time to the consummation of the age in which his sheep endure. Partly because it is reasonable that universality of time be co-understood with universality of places — and consequently since saying "feed my sheep" he comprehended his sheep everywhere on earth, it follows that the same comprehend them for every future time. Partly because Christ saying what more ought he to have done for his vineyard and he did not do it — would have insufficiently provided for the Christian Church establishing it one flock without one pastor living together with the flock — conversing with the sheep meekly, that is sensibly — according to the mode of the very sheep, which live not only spiritually but sensibly according to sensible nature: since however it is written of him, it reaches from end to end forcefully and disposes all things gently — Wisdom 8.

**The third and best and most certain way** proceeds from the express divine revelation made to its holy Church: for as below from word to word authorities will be brought forward — it is manifestly held that in this sense from saints innumerable and from holy universal councils was understood the institution of Peter's Pontificate over the whole Church made by Christ. And certainly more certainly is that to be the true sense of scripture which concordantly the transmitting saints with the definition of universal councils approaching we have. We confess therefore without any hesitation that any Peter's successor — instituted in the blessed Peter — is the pastor of the whole Church.

**To the first argument** therefore in opposition, of concomitants: preceding concomitants and subsequent are found duplicitous — either pertaining to the pastoral office or pertaining to the pastoral office's use or pertaining to non-pertinence to it. And of the things impertinent by the same to the pastoral office (such as that "get behind me Satan" as is clear in the very evangelical text) it is not fitting that it pertain to the successor: be solicited whether it looks to the successor. Of the pertaining however — they pertain in the same mode they pertain to the office to the successor also. Whence that "you are Peter" and "upon this rock etc." — because it necessarily pertains to the total pontificate — must also pertain to the successor; and this pertaining is necessary: for Peter's successor must be the rock, i.e. solid in faith — so that upon this rock Christ builds his Church. The difficulties however which are around this will be treated in the following chapter. What is said at John

however: "Do you love me" — in some way pertains to the pastoral office and in some way not. For the rectitude of the pastoral office requires Christ's love: the pastoral office itself however can be had and exercised without Christ's love — and therefore Christ's love pertains to the successor also — insofar as the rectitude of using the pastoral office pertains; but not insofar as having or exercising the very pastoral office.

And similarly what is adjoined: "when you were younger you used to gird yourself" — as far as the consummation of the prophetic word pertains — it is made with Peter; as far as the insinuated preparation of the pastoring soul for laying down life for Christ's sheep and the frequent following of prosecutions or death for Christ's sheep's good pastor — to the rectitude and fortitude of the successor pertains.

**To the second** it is said similarly: the sequence is nothing worth — nor is there equal or similar ratio that the words of the Lord extending the pastoral office to successors should extend and the words "I have prayed for you" should extend to the successor to the letter. For those words of Luke 22 at the letter regard only what is proper to the pastoral office — things pertaining thereto to the successor extend to the letter; and the rest pertaining to the pastoral office are said to him for himself and the successor. The remaining however at the letter are said to him alone.

**To the fourth** (which urged most): it is now clear the response — for Christ himself in Peter insinuated himself to be speaking to each of his successors: both

from the side of the pastoral office — as from the perpetuity of his own sheep; as was predeclared.

**To the fifth:** it is said there is not the same ratio of succession in the apostolate and of succession in the pontificate — for the apostle as the very name testifies: sounds sent from another as a legate (according to that Apostle at 2 Corinthians 5: "We function in an embassy for Christ" and at Ephesians 6: "I function in an embassy in this chain") — but it is not that of legates to claim successors for themselves — but the legation terminates with the legate; unless another is sent by the lord. A pastor however sounds an ordinary office: whose it is to have a successor — and therefore the Church does not have apostles who succeeded Christ's apostles; but it has bishops succeeding the apostles — not as to the apostolate authority, but insofar as episcopal dignity as much as authority. Whence if formally and most acutely it must be said: not even Petrus has a successor in the apostolate — since Peter had the apostolate in common with the remaining apostles, and equal ratio is in the apostolate succession of all. But because Peter's successor succeeds him in the pastoral office of Christ's sheep (which is the pontificate to be sent) — from this very fact he succeeds in the principal apostolate office: since as Thomas says it was to govern the Catholic Church: for this was delegated to all apostles in common by Christ — this singularly by pastoral office given to Peter — only Peter's successor inherits this — from this therefore he succeeds Petrus in pontificatu ecclesiae catholicae. Hence alone the seat of Peter's successors is called and is the apostolic see: since in it alone the authority of governing the

Catholic Church (which among the faculties of a legate of the apostles holds the highest place) resides; hence the successor of Peter apostolicus, hence his dignity or office of the apostolate, hence his apostolic authority is called: as it were comprehending supreme authority from all apostles inherited. Whence the solution of all the questions appears — and why Peter alone among apostles has a successor in the apostolic authority — and how the episcopal order succeeds all apostles in equal dignity and authority — and insofar as bishops are all equals; this neither at all prevents the truth declared. And why the Jerusalem bishop does not succeed Jacob in the apostolic authority — the Roman bishop however succeeds Peter in the apostolic authority: because Peter had apostolic authority also as ordinary pastor from Christ instituted over the universal flock; Jacob however had it only as apostle. And this not by human reason or will done — but by Christ's true divine institution it is shown to be ordained — while Peter alone as pastor of his sheep instituting saying "Feed my sheep."

---

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN

### *That the Roman Pontiff Succeeds Peter in the Pontificate of the Whole Church*

---

With Peter's succession supposed, it must be shown who that successor of Peter in the pastoral care of the whole Church is — for it has its own difficulties whether he is the Roman bishop.

**First** objection: from the side of time — because the Roman Pontiff was born many years after Peter's pontificate, since Peter first sat at Antioch and for many years before without any particular see.

**And confirmation:** this ratio of arguing as the Apostle argues at Romans 4, where he proves from the circumstance of time and fact that Abraham was justified not from circumcision but from faith — no other reason being valid than that Abraham was just before God through faith before the circumcision. If this argument of his is valid, necessarily this is valid: Peter received the keys from Christ when he was not yet bishop of the city of Rome — but was one among the apostles: therefore the keys are not given him according to what he was afterwards made or changed in place or office (just as Abraham's justice was not reputed according to whatever he was made after faith) but as he was only an apostle.

**Second:** if the Roman Pontiff were Peter's successor in the care of the whole Church — it would be necessary (lest the same often be repeated about this succession: we always speak of it, unless when sometimes we treat of succession in the Roman episcopate alone) that in any Roman Pontiff Christ's words necessarily pertaining to Peter's successor be verified — but about any Roman Pontiff this is not fitting to be verified: therefore the Roman Pontiff is not Peter's successor. The destruction of the sequence is proved: from this that the Roman Pontiff can slip into heresy — and thus will not be verified of him Christ's words "you are Peter" i.e. solid in faith; "and upon this rock I will build my Church" — since the solidity of faith upon which the Church is to be built would not be found — "and I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail" — which all to Peter's successor shown to be said.

**Third:** because not every Roman Pontiff has Christ's charity — which however Christ thirdly exacted in institution of the pastoral office. Therefore he is not Peter's successor who does not exactly succeed from Christ then in charity.

**Fourth:** because not every Roman Pontiff feeds Christ's sheep — but many of them feed their own sheep while exercising the pontificate for their own glory, authority, utility, and other such things. But the Lord saying "feed my sheep" signified Peter's successors ought to be or be pastors who love Christ's sheep themselves and pasture them in doctrine, justice, and such things; or if they do not

love and do not teach, nothing of this word pertains to them: and through this not to be Peter's successors.

**Fifth:** because early Roman Pontiffs refused to be called universal bishops: Gregory in his epistles reprehends this and narrates his predecessors to have refused this. If Gregory when others did not wish to be called universal bishop — it follows he either was not, or did not believe himself to be universal bishop: the same sounds universal pontiff and pontiff of the whole Church. Therefore the Roman Pontiff does not succeed Peter in the pontificate of the whole Church.

**Sixth:** the Council of Nicaea (as is written in book 10, chapter 6 of the Ecclesiastical History) established thus: "and at Alexandria or in the city of Rome — whatever old custom continues; so that either the Egyptian or here the suburban churches he administers the solicitude." If the Roman Pontiff is Peter's successor in the pontificate of the whole Church, he would not have presumed to decide Nicaea's bounds of his solicitude in suburban churches.

**Seventh:** if the Roman Pontiff by Christ's institution presides over the whole Church as Christ's general vicar, it follows — he sinned and the ones who were not and are not under the Roman Pontiff's obedience sinned. And hence it follows firstly the primitive whole Church totally erred — when there was not yet a Roman Pontiff. It follows then so many saints and martyrs to four hundred years after Christ to have erred — when then the Roman Pontiff was not recognized as pastor of the whole Church. It follows afterward Asia, Africa and Greece to have been in

damnation — as not recognizing the Roman Pontiff as the head of all. It follows the many Christians who today are in Persia, India, all the orient to be damned — because they are not subject to Roman Pontiffs. And it is manifested that these did not recognize the Roman Pontiff — because their bishops were not instituted by him nor were their councils celebrated.

**Eighth:** Jerome of illustrious men writes that Achatius bishop of Caesarea a disciple of Eusebius of Pamphilus — in the reign of Constantius — deposed Liberius Pope and constituted Felix. It is established however that this conflicts with the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, if he were the antistes of the whole Church.

**Ninth:** if any Church is first and mother of all churches and immediately founded by Christ the Lord — it is no other but the Jerusalem Church: which for many years existed before the Roman; from which all apostles and bishops went to the universal circuit of the earth. In sign of which from all churches — even the Roman — collections were made for the Jerusalem Church.

To understand this matter, two things must be considered: first whence it is, second by what reason it is known that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter. Around the first however, it must be distinguished between the ratio of succeeding and the ratio of the successor: for the ratio of succeeding is not evangelical institution — but the subsequent fact by which the Roman Church was appropriated to Peter as appropriation confirmed. I declare singula: cautioning the reader, in the first place that one thing

is to succeed Peter, and another is for this Roman Pontiff to succeed Peter. The ratio that Peter has a successor — the institution is evangelical: since the Lord in Peter instituted the pastoral office of the whole world, as in the preceding is manifested; the ratio however that Peter succeeds here — i.e. in the Roman church — is not evangelical institution: since evangelical institution of these mutations does not impede itself — but left this to be disposed by subsequent facts. Wherefore from this that the appropriation being confirmed, the Roman Church was dedicated to Peter's pontificate — from thence it arose that the Roman Pontiff succeeds Peter. The appropriation moreover confirmed we say — since it was confirmed by Peter's death — and since by Christ's authority the firmness of firmness it obtained. For (as the Church sings) and Ambrose in the oration of Jonah against Auxentius, of basilikas to be handed over: which you have in the 5th book of Ambrose's epistles, after the 32nd epistle asserts — and before him, in the third book of the destruction of Jerusalem chapter 2, Egippus affirms: Christ willed that Peter going out from the city of Rome obedient to death in Rome be present — saying on account of this "I return to Rome to be crucified again": so that not Peter's bare death in Rome — but death ordered by Christ in the city of Rome, might confirm the Roman See in Peter's succession. If you look at the origin therefore and the beginning of the Roman Pontiff's succession to Peter — you will find it to have been the appropriation of the Roman Church to Peter's pontificate confirmed — and Peter's death — and Christ's mandate. Now when we say Peter and Roman Pontiff and Pontiff of the Catholic Church — do not

understand two pontificates — for they are not two in act — but in potency what could have been two: as appears from what has been said. Whence it does not hold as two episcopates united — for there was not in the Roman Church an episcopate before Peter — but Peter himself went out from Rome by his pontificate — not by something other than his, that he was carrying: so that the pontificate of Peter which he had in relation to the Catholic Church — he himself Peter referred to the Roman Church by appropriating it to himself. It matters moreover not a little this unity of pontificate — for to this that the same Roman Pontiff and Pontiff of the Catholic Church — not only in the unity of person, but in the identity of pontificate. In sign of which not two palliums are given to the Roman Pontiff — but one only — while however it is established that those having several pontificates are due several palliums.

If however the discourse is of the ratio of the successor — the evangelical institution is the ratio found for the successor. The Roman Pontiff indeed succeeding Peter has apostolic authority — from the evangelical voice of Christ: "feed my sheep" — since to each Peter's successor in Peter Christ said: "feed my sheep." Although moreover it has been that the apostolic see of the Roman Pontiff had its beginning from the appropriation of the Roman Church to Peter — from this confirmed however it is that the Roman Pontiff is Peter's successor — it is established truly from what was said. And it is allowed that the apostolic see of the Roman Pontiff had its beginning from the appropriation of the Roman Church to Peter: from this however the Roman Pontiff is not of

evangelical institution: since evangelical institution is of these mutations without impediment: but left disposing this to subsequent facts. And he is likewise confirmed: since while we say Peter and Roman Pontiff and Pontiff of the Catholic Church — not two understands pontificates — for they are not two in act — but in potency three could have been: as appears from what has been said.

**The solution of all the questions** appears: and why only Peter among apostles has a successor in apostolic authority — and how the episcopal order succeeds all apostles in equal dignity and authority — and insofar as all bishops are equals: this nothing at all prevents the truth declared. And why the Jerusalem bishop does not succeed Jacob in apostolic authority — the Roman bishop however succeeds Peter in apostolic authority: because Peter had apostolic authority also as ordinary pastor from Christ instituted over the universal flock; Jacob however had it only as apostle.

**To the first ultimately brought argument:** it is said nothing prevents the succession of the Roman Pontiffs to Peter — insofar as the Roman Pontiff was, from having received the keys born after them. For it suffices to the successor to be born before the death of the one to whom he succeeds.

**To the argument moreover formed** to the similarity of Paul the apostle's argument of justification of Abraham: it responds that military it is not against our sentence, but rather against those arguing. For just as in Abraham the reputation to justice of Abraham convenes from faith — and not from circumcision subsequently followed: so proportionally in Peter the

acceptance of the keys convenes from the pontificate of the Catholic Church at the time — since the keys were not given him when he became a pastor of the Christian sheep — and not from the Roman Church or Roman Pontificate subsequently followed. And similarly just as the justice reputed to Abraham was not restricted and concluded to the status of the preputial — but extends itself to the status subsequently followed of circumcision (said by the Apostle there: "therefore ex faith is the promise firm to all seed, not to that alone who is of the law etc.") — so the accepted keys are extended from the subsequent pontificate of the Roman Pontiff — according to the mutation by which both in place and office the Roman Church was appropriated to Peter as he subsequently became the Roman Pontiff, so that through himself the kingdom of heaven is opened to all kindreds of the earth. Whence it appears from such argument — even if the acceptance of the keys does not pertain to Peter except insofar as he was then — nevertheless the accepted keys are not restricted and concluded to that state itself — but following the similarity of Abraham having the extension to the subsequent state of the Roman Pontificate — they are extended and appropriated to the Roman Church by Peter as he subsequently became the Roman Pontiff.

**To the second** it is said it can be doubly understood that the Roman Pontiff — or Peter's successor — cannot be faithful, or heretical. Either about the person itself in order to the Catholic Church — or about his own person according to itself. And both modes are verified and both expressed by the Lord in

the Gospel. Solid faith in Peter and his successors according to their own persons signified the Lord and saying "you are Peter" in the present; and saying: "I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail" in the future. Faith moreover of the same in order to the Church — signified the Lord and saying "upon this rock I will build my Church" and saying "confirm your brothers." Nor does it prevent the person of the Roman Pontiff's faith according to his own person — that that person can be heretical: since that person when it first defines to be faithless, defines then to be Peter's successor — according to the truth of the matter and before God; before whose tribunal who does not believe already is judged: as John says chapter 3 — whatever may be before the ecclesiastical forum. And from the solidity of faith of the person of the Roman Pontiff in order to the Church — it proceeds that he cannot err by sententially defining about Christian faith: since in such definition the faith of the universal Church is built — and through it Christ's Church is built by Christ himself upon the seat of the apostolic See. It is established moreover the universal Church to be unable to err in faith. It is moreover permitted to note how suavely this faith definition is accommodated by the evangelical voice: faith indeed to construct the Church is established — since it is (as is said at Hebrews 10) the substance of things to be hoped and therefore it corresponds to the building and confirming act: since as the substance of the edifice regards, both sub and per the substance. But since faith is a gift of God: therefore Christ attributed the building of the Church to himself upon the apostolic see — saying: "and upon this rock I will build my Church" — to moreover firm

the wavering faithful from fluctuating ambiguities and questions which around faith arise — since this is the ministerial work of Peter and the successor — therefore it is said to Peter and the successor: "Confirm your brothers" — whatever the apostolic see acts in defining about faith, nothing else is than to declare what under faith by Christ given is contained: so that as thus it confirms his brothers. Whence and in the Chalcedonian synod, fathers said who gathered in the Constantinopolitan council — that they had traditionally taught about the Holy Spirit: not that less was in the preceding who gathered in Nicaea — inferring but declaring understanding against heretics. And hence it arises that definitions of faith from the apostolic see are subject also to the very Roman Pontiff — just as it is subject to faith — not because to someone for a new thing he is subjected, but because what he implicitly believed, he holds to explicitly believe — from this that faith sufficiently explained is — insofar as this what was first not explained to not pertain to the truth of faith. But if to anyone this response appears marvellous — let him remember that it is written: marvellous are your testimonies, they are Lord. For these are not Christ's testimonies — but what may be marvelled at about the faithful is the such great divine grace assistance to his own vicar on earth: since Caiaphas the pontiff of the synagogue of the less legitimate one, and the persecutor of Christ himself — stood before the Lord to prophesying by reason of the pontificate: witnessing John the evangelist when he says "not from himself he said — but since he was pontiff of that year he prophesied that Jesus was to die for the nation" at John 11. Why did John teach this, why did

it reveal — unless that the divine assistance peculiar to the Pontiff he wished to reveal.

**To the third** it is said: that exact triple love from Peter looks to the rectitude of the pastoral office — and therefore who does not succeed Peter in the love of Christ, by no means succeeds him in the goodness of pastoral exercise; but the pastor is from office and name — the hired hand however by study and exercise. And therefore although one not loving and not feeding is unworthy of the pastoral office and would merit to be deprived: we are not however through both testaments deprived from saying it. For Ezekiel chapter 34 reprehends evil pastors — who did not feed God's flock, but themselves fed — with the prophetic threats of privation of the pastoral office — and yet they left the pastoral office. Matthew also chapter 23 above the chair the Lord says of Moses — scribes and Pharisees sat, all things they say to you serve and do, however according to their works do not do.

**To the fourth:** it is said that to love and feed Christ's sheep — pertains to Peter's successors under the ratio of commission and debt; Christ committed that they feed Christ's sheep and from that office obligated him taking up the pontificate. Whence if neither loves nor feeds — not therefore the place is not that of him — for much pertains to him to feed Christ's sheep — and the place demands to be fed and loved: it demands quippe this place both feeding and loving: since it exacts that love and feed he ought. And although the one not loving the unworthy is of the pastoral office and would merit to be deprived — not

however through this is privately deprived from both testaments we say. Ezekiel chapter 34 indeed reprehends evil pastors — who did not feed God's flock but themselves fed — with the prophetic threats of privation of the pastoral office for themselves: and yet they left the pastoral office.

**To the fifth:** it is said Gregorius's predecessors to have refused to be called universal — for the reason as he himself by thousands says — since if one universal bishop says, he alone seems to say: and thus removes episcopal order from the rest. Not however for that reason that the authority of the Roman Pontiff is restricted and does not extend to the universal Church: but the proud vocabulary as injurious to the remaining bishops it horrified Gregorius; and not in the thing of the apostolic authority extending itself to the universal Church. Whence after inferring below words of Maurice Augustus to be brought forward — of Peter's authority over the whole Church: subjoins care and the principate of the whole Church is committed; and yet universal apostle is not called. Where it appears Gregorius simultaneously to affirm care of the whole Church and deny the universal vocabulary. On account of which posterior Roman Pontiffs tenaciously holding the thing nor departing from Gregorian humility — from the rectum translated the universal name to the oblique; and they subscribe in the present day: "I N. bishop of the Catholic Church."

**To the sixth:** it is said: that the Roman Pontiff by Christ's institution presides over the whole Church — can be doubly understood: either as to the ratio of the

beginning; and thus false is it, according to the predeclared. Or presupposing the appropriation of the Roman Church to Peter — and thus most true is it — and therefore the sequence is conceded: namely that all those who did not recognize him as prelate sinned. And when it is inferred firstly that the primitive whole Church totally erred — the sequence is denied: since then the appropriation of the Roman Church to Peter was not yet done — by which presupposed the Roman Pontiff presides over all. It sufficed indeed then that the whole Church recognize Peter as pastor of the whole Church: after the appropriated moreover of the Roman Church, it is necessary to recognize the Roman Pontiff as Peter's successor — pastor of the whole Church — not insofar as he is Roman Pontiff — but insofar as he is Peter's successor.

**To the second:** when thus it is inferred that so many martyrs and saints to four hundred years sinned — it is responded false to be of such martyrs and saints not to have recognized the Roman Pontiff. From the beginning not the Jerusalem Church from Peter was recognized and successively the Roman Pontiff succeeding him: as the subsequent authorities of the saints manifest.

**And similarly** when thirdly Asia, Africa and Greece are inferred to have erred — since they were not subject to the Roman Church: manifestly the error — and things most false are induced to be proved: Gregorius's full register of Asia Africa and Greece testifies the opposite. What finally is induced — that Christians today Oriental do not sub-fall to the

Roman Church (unless of schismatics the discourse is) — false is it — from the deeds in the Council of Florence under Eugene the fourth it can appear: there indeed Jacobites, Armenians and Greeks to recognize the Roman Pontiff as pastor of the whole Church confessed themselves.

**To the confirmation of the subjunct:** because bishops are not instituted by the Pope, nor are their councils celebrated by the Pope's authority — it is already clear what must be said: namely that such custom of executions in whatever provinces neither removes nor diminishes the Pope's authority. See moreover how many times in our age it has been seen that Orientals sent to the Roman Pontiff for surrogating a bishop or confirming the elected: at the time of Alexander VI and Julius II.

**To the eighth:** it is said we speak of divine right — and those arguing object a condemned violent deed: since as the very words of Jerome testify: it is not Achatius so much who claimed to take the place of Liberius as that Felix the Arian was substituted. Whence that Felix is not to be counted in the catalogue of Pontiffs: as Augustine testifies in the epistle to Generosus — and it is epistle 165. There indeed Augustine from Peter to the then Roman Pontiff Anastasius reviewing successively one by one — puts Damasus as Liberius's successor — not Felix.

**To the ninth:** it is said the Roman Church's appellation can be understood either of the body of the Roman Church itself according to itself — or according to its head: and although the Roman Church according to its remaining members is not

first — nor mother of all churches — nor immediately instituted by Christ — yet the same Roman Church according to its head Peter and Peter's successor — is first and mother and teacher of all churches — and having authority and firmness immediately from Christ by the evangelical voice: as was predeclared. Whence both of the canons and the senses of the saints sounding the Roman Church first, teacher and mother of all churches — or founded from Christ the Lord by the evangelical voice — are true by reason of the head. And this intend those who wrote these things: as from this appears that their sentence is founded on the Lord's words to Peter — who was the head and in his successors is of the Roman Church. Whence nothing prevents this primacy which of the Jerusalem Church are brought: for that was not prior to Peter; but was subjected to Peter. What moreover the collection of the Jerusalem Church from other churches shows — not as to prelates but as to those needing from others they gave: as is clear at Galatians 2 — and therefore impertinent they are for the purpose.

---

## CHAPTER FOURTEEN

*Authorities of the Ancient Saints and Councils  
Affirming that the Pontificate of the Roman Pontiff  
as Successor of Peter over the Whole Church Was  
Instituted by Christ in Peter*

---

It remains to be useful for those who do not know from the ancient fathers of the Church in Asia, Africa, and Europe — that it was venerated that the Roman Pontiff as pastor of the whole Church — not by human but divine reason — namely because in Peter he was instituted rector of the universal Church. Therefore the sentences of the Greek and Latin ancient fathers and doctors of the Church are to be brought — not all, nor of all, but enough for the clear knowledge that the Roman Pontiff is Peter's successor and always in Peter was instituted pastor and rector of the whole Church.

And to begin from the Greeks: Chrysostom, homily 54 upon Matthew, expounding that "upon this rock" — says: Peter he constituted as the future pastor of the Church. And below: God alone can grant the remission of sins — and as the future Church with so many waves impetuous it buffeting by such enormous fluctuations remain immovable — and whose pastor and head a fisherman man — and the most ignoble in the circuit of the lands reluctant — with the nature of

adamant firmness surpass: all these things he promises to give himself. And below: this namely Peter he put before the universal circuit of the earth. And though he glossed it above: "upon this rock I will build my church," i.e. the faith and confession — below nevertheless he says: "and I say to you, you are Peter" and "upon this rock I will build my church" — i.e. "upon faith and upon you Peter I will build my church": "and below more: the edificatory above you, super you Petrum," as he said it: and I will build above you.

And on the last homily upon John — treating that: "Simon John do you love me more than these?" and says: Setting aside others, the care of the brothers is committed to him only — nor does he mention negation, nor does he upbraid: only says if you love me — take up the care of the brothers. And below treating that "follow me" he says: here in which he says to Peter "follow me" — the stewardship of the faithful to all is instituted. And below treating that "until I come": he says: I mean while I am directing this John to preaching — you now I direct to the pontificate of the world: and in this follow me.

Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria in the book *Thesau*: Just as Christ received from the Father the scepter of the Church of the nations — a prince going out from Israel over every principate and power and over every whatever — and committed fully to Peter and to his successors: and to no others than Petro Christus what his own is fully — but to themselves alone he gave.

And again. The feet of Christ's humanity are: namely himself man: to whom the whole trinity gave fullest

power: whom one of the three assumed in unity of person — and passed to the father over every principate and power — and dismissed it through the sacrament and power of Peter and his Church. And again. Peter all bow by divine right: and the primates of the world as to Lord Jesus himself obey. And again. Of the apostolic thrones of the Roman Pontiffs alone it belongs to reprehend, correct, institute, restore, dissolve, and in place of him who built it bind.

Maximus in the epistle directed to Orientals. All those ends of the world who sincerely received and receive the Lord — and the Catholics throughout the whole earth confessing the true faith look as to the sun upon the Roman Church and in it receive the light of Catholic and apostolic faith.

Cyril the patriarch of Jerusalem speaking from the person of Christ says to Peter. You with all fineness and perfectly — and I with all fineness completely by sacrament and authority will be as I am and with you.

The Council of Chalcedon (as is read in its deeds) in the time of holy Leo and of the Emperor Martian acclaimed Leo Pope. Leo most holy apostolic and universal.

And in the earlier time of the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian (as is held at distinction 21 now) when Marcellinus Pope and afterward martyr led by fear had sacrificed to idols — a synod of bishops collected for this reason said: the first see will not be judged by anyone.

And long before Anacletus martyr in the time of Trajan — a native Greek — a Athenian by homeland — says: the most sacred Roman and apostolic Church not from the apostles but from the Lord and Savior himself obtained the primacy: just as blessed Peter the apostle was said: "you are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and I will give you the keys, etc." as is held at distinction 22, sacrosancta. And again as is held at distinction 21 in the new: the same says in the new testament after Christ the Lord by Peter the priestly order began: since it was given to him first the pontificate in Christ's Church — the Lord saying to him: "you are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church, etc." From this: the ejection of supreme Pontiffs to himself the Lord reserved — distinction 79 ejectionem.

Marcellus Pope and martyr in the time of Diocletian and Maximian — or Constantius and Galerius who took up the government of the Empire after Diocletian and Maximian — in chapter, we ask you: — and is held at distinction 24, question 1, about Peter, says he is the head of the whole Church to whom the Lord said "you are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church," etc.

Cyprian also martyr in the tract of the simplicity of prelates — says those things which are recited at distinction 24, question 1 — which for the cause of brevity need not be repeated. In those indeed of Peter's Pontificate sufficiently appears — as predeclared is.

Ambrose in sermon 46, about the faith of Peter the apostle — and it is held at distinction 1 chapter

fidelior — says about Peter. As a good pastor he received the flock to be guarded: so that the one who had before himself been infirm for all becomes firmness — and who himself had wavered in the interrogation's temptation — might establish the rest of others in the solidity of faith. Also for the solidity of devotion of the churches he is called a rock: just as says the Lord: "you are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church." And in the same idem in the dominical hymn Peter he calls the rock of the Church — saying: this very rock of the Church singing guilty loves. Augustine testifies indeed in the first book of the retractions, chapter 21, that this hymn is Ambrose's.

And in sermon 11 of miracles. This sole ship of the Church therefore the Lord boarded — in which Peter master is constituted: — saying the Lord: "upon this rock I will build my church." Which ship in the height of the present age navigating — so navigates that those who took on perishing the world, saves harmless. Whose figure already we see in the old testament. Just as Noah's ark navigating the world conflagrating saves all who it embraces — and thus transacted the flood to the ark of Noah the dove brought the sign of peace: so also transacted the judgment to Peter's Church Christ the joy of peace brings: since he himself the dove or peace is.

And idem on the first epistle to Timothy, chapter 3, treating that: "as you ought to converse in the house of the living God etc." says. Since the whole world is God's — the Church however is called his house: whose today rector is Damasus: the world moreover

in prevarication is disturbed by diverse error — therefore there it is necessary to say is the house of God and truth — where according to his own will is feared.

And in book of the excess of his brother, in the name of Satiri commends — and protects the wisdom of the same in pilgrim parts inquiring whether if a bishop were Catholic — meaning this: that with the Roman Church it converge; saying chapter 7: I drew to myself a bishop of bishops. The same at what follows page: "which is mine." Jerome on Matthew says: to Simon who believed in the rock Christ — Petrus the name was given: and according to the metaphor of the rock — Peter is rightly said to him: "I will build my church above you." And below by the gloss on the same: "and upon this rock I will build my church." i.e. "upon te Petrum" edificabo my church "above you."

And again to Damasus: and it is held at distinction 24, question 1 — because old: I proclaiming nothing except following Christ as companion, I join in communion by the reward of Petri's cathedra: upon that rock I know the Church to be built. Whoever eats the lamb outside of this house is a profane one. Whoever is not in Noah's ark will perish in the flood prevailing.

And the same again to Damasus: and it is held at distinction 24, question 1, this: this is my faith, Reverend Pope — in which I confess it — if it is confirmed by your apostolate's judgment: whoever wishes to blame me — let him prove himself either incompetent or malicious or non-Catholic. Where

because you see from the apostolic see's judgment to depend — being Catholic or heretic — it is the highest tribunal of Christ on earth in matters of faith to be known.

And idem in book 1 against Jovinian chapter 14: ait: Among the 12, one is elected so that the head constituted the occasion of schism might be removed. And he speaks indubitably of the election of Peter not from the apostles but from Christ: as appears from the solution immediately subjoined of the question: but why not John the virgin was elected? He solves: because a good master who had said "my peace I give you, etc." — to give the cause to seem of envy to the adolescent whom he had loved.

The same again epistle 2 to Damasus: and it is held at distinction 24, question 1, these: this is our faith if your apostolate approve it: whoever wishes to blame me — let him prove himself either incompetent or malicious or non-Catholic.

Augustine not only Peter the prince of the apostles affirms: but when the apostolic see was consulted about faith against the Pelagian heresy — from two Councils of Carthage and Millevitan subscribed was found. And responding Innocent Pope to the Carthaginian council. The fathers institution sacerdotal office guarding — you did not think ought to be trampled — which you know by the tradition of the fathers has been decreed by divine and not human sentence — namely that whatever is acted in the distant and separate provinces not prius be judged to be finishing, until it came to the notice of this see; so that by full authority its sentence be confirmed —

and thence other churches would take from it as from their native spring — that they proceeding through the various regions of the pure head's waters incorrupt might remain — and through diverse regions of the pure waters incorrupt might remain: what to precept, which to wash — those as if in a non-cleansable font dirtied — with worthy water of life to wash. And to the council moreover of Millevitan. How many times the reason of faith is ventilated — I think all our brothers and co-bishops ought not to refer except to Peter, i.e. to his name's and honor's author: even as now your charity referred — what through the whole world can profit to all churches in common.

Augustine to Paulinus, epistle 106, referring these deeds commends Innocentius's letters with the response subjoining: all things to us he wrote back in the same mode as was fitting and as it was right and becoming of the apostolic see's antistes.

And again in the second book of baptism against Donatists, chapter 1 (and it is held at distinction 2, question 7 puto) — the chair of Peter to any bishopric preferred comparing Cyprian to Peter says: I must fear lest I exist contumelious toward Peter — for who does not know that the apostolate's principate is to any bishopric to be preferred — yet the same is the glory of martyrdom.

Also in the second book of Christian doctrine — not far from the beginning — decretals epistles of the apostolic see among canonical scriptures to be counted he censures — saying indeed: in the canonical scriptures of the Catholic churches — than

the most diligent one of many divine scriptures investigator follow the authority: among which surely those are the ones which the apostolic see to have and to others to have sent and from it others merited to receive. Whoever these decretals epistles of faith which the apostolic see has or sent inter-canonical maintains to be scriptural — without doubt supposes the apostolic see not only to be preeminent of all prelate sees — but divinely as it were of faith teacher.

Gregory in the register's book 4, epistle 32 to Maurice Augustus says: to all knowing the Gospel is clear — that by the dominical voice to the holy and of all apostles the prince Peter the apostle the care of the whole Church was committed: since to him it is said Peter do you love me? feed my sheep. To him it is said: behold Satan has demanded to sift you as wheat — and I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail — and you when converted confirm your brothers. To him it is said: you are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of hell will not prevail against it: and I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven and whatever you shall have bound on earth will be bound in heaven and whatever you shall have loosed on earth will be loosed in heaven. Behold the keys of the heavenly kingdom received —

And the principate is committed.

Saint Leo the first, in the third sermon on the anniversary of his assumption day says: of the whole world one Peter is chosen — who both to the vocation of all nations and all apostles and all fathers of the Church is set before: so that in the people of

God there might be many priests and many pastors — yet Peter rules principally all whom also Christ rules principally. Great and marvellous to this most beloved man divine dignity bestowed power: and if anything with him common to others willed to be — never gave what he did not deny to others — except through him.

The venerable Bede on John chapter 1, looking into him therefore says: he saw the simplicity of his heart, the sublimity of spirit: on whose merits all of the Church rightly ought to be preferred.

Bernard not only many times calls the Roman Pontiff Jesus Christ's vicar and the head of the whole Church — but in the first epistle to Pope Eugene number 337 in the order of epistles says: 'The place where you stand is holy land — it is Peter's place — it is the place of the prince of the apostles — where the feet of him stood: the place of the one whom the Lord constituted lord of his house and prince of all his possession: duly to such a pastor such a nourishment was committed the Church — while it was still tender while still in the cradles.

And in epistle 242 to the Romans who departed from Pope: Why do you govern the earth, why do you rule the king of the earth with unbearable fury — the sacred and apostolic see singularly sublimated by divine gifts and privileges — daring with sacrilegious audacity to attack — to reduce the honor of them? And in epistle 131 to the Milanese of the fullness of apostolic power says: 'The Roman Church is greatly clement but nonetheless powerful: faithful counsel and every acceptance worthy: do not abuse clemency

lest power oppress. But someone says: I will show the owed reverence and nothing more. Be it so. Make what you say: since if you show the owed and complete it. Fullness indeed of power over universal churches of the world by singular prerogative of the apostolic see donated is: who therefore resists this power resists the ordering of God. It can if useful it judged new ordain episcopates where before they did not exist: it can those which exist others depress — others sublime — as the ratio to itself dictates: in this that from the ends of the earth sublime whatever ecclesiastical persons evoke and cogere to its presence: not once or twice but however many times it will judge it expedient. Furthermore prompt it is all whoever disobedience if by chance attempting resists to avenge.

In the deeds of the Constantian Council, among the condemned articles of John Wyclef and John Hus these two are found: namely Peter is not and was not the head of the holy Catholic Church — it is not of the necessity of salvation to believe the Roman Church to be supreme among other churches. And it is subjoined: error is it — for as much as he negates the primacy of the supreme Pontiff above other particular churches.

Saint Thomas in book 4 against the gentiles chapter 76 — after he had in multiple ways proved one bishop to be prelated from Christ to the whole Church — subjoins: By this however is excluded the presumptuous error of some who try to subtract themselves from obedience and subjection of Peter

— the Roman Pontiff the universal pastor of the Church not recognizing.

And in the universal council of Florence under Eugene the fourth — where the union of the Greeks, Armenians and Jacobites with the Roman Church is read to have been made — are held these words: We define the holy apostolic see and the Roman Pontiff to hold the primacy over the whole world: and the same Roman Pontiff to be the successor of blessed Peter the prince of the apostles and a true vicar of Christ — and the head of the whole Church and father and doctor of all Christians: and to him in blessed Peter to have been given by our Lord Jesus Christ full power of feeding, ruling and governing the universal Church: as also in the deeds of ecumenical councils and in the sacred canons is contained. Here note it is not newly from this synod to have been found this definition — but itself to be contained in the deeds of other universal councils. And therefore this one council suffices for all to firm the faith of this truth.

Furthermore the crowd of canons and doctors (which no one can enumerate) the same sentient. Then evidently indeed from those which we brought is clear — the Roman Pontiff to be Peter's successor — instituted from Christ in Peter as pastor of the whole Church — so that no place of doubt is left. If moreover anyone after these is found hesitating — either rude and inept — or with heretics and schismatics savors — or certainly Christian is not: uneducated indeed greatly and indocile is whoever in all things seeks mathematical certitude: as the

philosophers hand down. It is proper of heretics and schismatics to use sacred scripture — however according to the sense which they themselves make it sound. Of true Catholics however wisdom is: to understand sacred scripture according to the sense which the saints doctors — which the sacred councils — by apostolic authority confirmed have handed down. Wherefore since the evangelical texts for the purpose are present — and the doctrine of the saints conforming in the purpose appears — with absolutely no saint reluctant — with the sacred councils with apostolic authority being found definition — and all the Christian age from Peter all the way in the holy Catholic Church this confessed is found — and the remaining doctors' testimonies are innumerable: — certain is it thus rendered that the Roman Pontiff is Peter's successor — instituted in Peter from Christ as the pastor of the whole Church — so that more certain faith cannot be had.

*Printed at Milan by Giovanni De Castiglione in the month of  
August, 1521 AD.*

---

— **FINIS** —

*Translated by Gelacio of Saint Thomas  
@ofsaintthomas on X*